

CHARACTERIZATION OF YOUNG MEASURES GENERATED BY SEQUENCES IN BV AND BD

FILIP RINDLER

ABSTRACT. First, this work presents a new and improved proof strategy for the recent characterization theorem for generalized Young measures generated by sequences in BV by Kristensen and the author [*Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 197 (2010), 539–598]. The present proof is based on a localization technique together with a rigidity argument and avoids employing a relaxation theorem. Then, based on this new technique, we prove an analogous characterization result for Young measures generated by sequences in the space BD of functions of bounded deformation. This theorem places these Young measures in duality to symmetric-quasiconvex functions. For this purpose we need to strengthen a recent rigidity result for BD-functions and their associated tangent Young measures, which is also interesting in its own right. Finally, as an application of the characterization theorem, we show how for Young measures with an “atomic” part one can find a generating sequence respecting this structure.

MSC (2010): 49J45 (PRIMARY); 28B05, 46G10

KEYWORDS: Young measure characterization, BV, BD, rigidity.

DATE: December 26, 2011.

1. INTRODUCTION

The characterization of the set of Young measures generated by a certain class of sequences is a recurring problem in Young measure theory and its applications. The first major results in this field are due to Kinderlehrer & Pedregal [12, 13, 23] for sequences of gradients bounded in $W^{1,p}$ with $1 < p \leq \infty$ (and also for $p = 1$ if one additionally assumes equiintegrability). Their characterization puts the generated “gradient” Young measures in duality with quasiconvex functions (introduced by Morrey [21], for a modern introduction see Dacorogna’s book [7]) with p -growth. Some ideas also go back to Tartar’s lecture notes [31] and the investigations into microstructure by Ball & James [4]. For further related results, also see for example [11, 15, 18, 29, 30].

Part of the interest in Young measure characterization theorems in the spirit of Kinderlehrer & Pedregal stems from the fact that they reveal a duality to the convexity class relevant to the corresponding minimization problems. Indeed, the “necessity” direction of such a result immediately yields (sequential) lower semicontinuity of integral functionals with integrands in the corresponding convexity class. On the other hand, the “sufficiency” direction is interesting for instance in relaxation theory, cf. [23]: If a given variational problem has no classical solution, one may extend the class of admissible minimizers to include Young measures (interpreted as fine mixtures of functions). The characterization result then provides constraints on the class of relaxed minimizers to be considered. In the final Section 7 we also give another, apparently new, application to the splitting of generating sequences for generalized gradient Young measure with an “atomic” part.

This work considers Young measures related to the space BV of functions of bounded variation and the space BD of functions of bounded deformation (see the following section

for definitions). Owing to the possible presence of concentration effects, sequences from these spaces are not amenable to a treatment with classical Young measures. A remedy in the form of generalized Young measures was introduced by DiPerna and Majda [8] in the context of fluid dynamics. We here follow the Young measure framework of [16, 26]; for a recent overview and historical remarks see [25].

The first characterization theorem for Young measures generated by sequences in BV was given in [16] and its proof was based on the BV-lower semicontinuity theorem in [17] (proved without Young measure theory). The lower semicontinuity or “necessity” part of that characterization theorem was later also proved directly (and without Alberti’s Rank One Theorem [1]) in [24].

The aim of this work is two-fold: First, we want to give a cleaner proof of the “sufficiency” part of the BV-Young measure characterization theorem. In particular, the present proof does not rely on a relaxation theorem and is self-contained within the framework of generalized Young measures. Second, we will show how to extend the proof strategy to obtain a characterization theorem for Young measures generated by sequences in BD. In preparation for this we establish an improved rigidity assertion for blow-ups of BD-Young measures, which is also interesting in its own right.

In BV, we prove (see the following section for notation):

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ be a Young measure with $\lambda_\nu(\partial\Omega) = 0$. Then ν is a gradient Young measure, $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$, if and only if there exists $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ with $[\nu] = Du$, and for all quasiconvex $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ with linear growth at infinity, the following two Jensen-type inequalities hold:*

$$(i) \quad h\left(\langle \text{id}, \nu_x \rangle + \langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x)\right) \leq \langle h, \nu_x \rangle + \langle h^\#, \nu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x)$$

for $\mathcal{L}^d$ -almost every $x \in \Omega$, and

$$(ii) \quad h^\#(\langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle) \leq \langle h^\#, \nu_x^\infty \rangle$$

for λ_ν^s -almost every $x \in \Omega$.

We remark that by recent result of Kirchheim and Kristensen [14] in conjunction with Alberti’s Rank One Theorem [1], condition (ii) is always satisfied, see Remark 5.1 for details.

By Theorem 5.4 of [24] (the “necessity” or lower semicontinuity part of the characterization result) it follows that we only need to show the “sufficiency” part of the previous theorem, i.e. we need to prove:

Proposition 1.2. *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ be a Young measure with $\lambda_\nu(\partial\Omega) = 0$ such that there exists $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ with $[\nu] = Du$, and such that for all quasiconvex $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ with linear growth at infinity the Jensen-type inequalities (i) and (ii) from the preceding theorem hold. Then, $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$.*

In contrast to the proof strategy in [16] we here rely on a local approach, i.e. we consider blow-ups of Young measures in the form of tangent Young measures as introduced in [24] (we use the newer versions of the localization principles from [25]). This strategy is somewhat reminiscent of the one employed by Kinderlehrer & Pedregal [12], which proceeds by reduction to the case of “homogeneous” Young measures and a geometric Hahn–Banach argument. Owing to the more complex fine structure of BV-functions as opposed to $W^{1,1}$ -functions, the present proof of course requires additional ideas. In particular, the local arguments differ

at “regular” and “singular” points. At the latter points we need to employ the Rigidity Lemma from [24] (see Lemma 2.1 below) to infer that the local structure of the tangent Young measures is sufficiently constrained. After the “local characterization” is complete and we have obtained generating sequences (consisting of gradients) for all tangent Young measures, we glue these sequences together in order to construct a sequence of gradients generating the Young measure we started with. In all of these arguments we rely heavily on the machinery for generalized Young measures developed in [16, 24–26].

In BD the corresponding characterization result is the following:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ be a Young measure with $\lambda_\nu(\partial\Omega) = 0$. Then ν is a BD-Young measure, $\nu \in \mathbf{BDY}(\Omega)$, if and only if there exists $u \in \mathbf{BD}(\Omega)$ with $[\nu] = Eu$, and for all symmetric-quasiconvex $h \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{d \times d})$ with linear growth at infinity, the following two Jensen-type inequalities hold:*

$$(i) \quad h\left(\langle \text{id}, \nu_x \rangle + \langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x)\right) \leq \langle h, \nu_x \rangle + \langle h^\#, \nu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x)$$

for $\mathcal{L}^d$ -almost every $x \in \Omega$, and

$$(ii) \quad h^\#(\langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle) \leq \langle h^\#, \nu_x^\infty \rangle$$

for λ_ν^s -almost every $x \in \Omega$.

In BD the rigidity is much weaker, see the discussion and examples in [25, 26]. In fact, in order to implement the same proof strategy as in the BV-case we first need to strengthen the result on “good blow-ups” from [26], see Theorem 6.2.

We finally remark that the preceding theorem of course also contains a characterization result for classical Young measures generated by sequences of symmetrized gradients in the spirit of the Kinderlehrer–Pedregal Theorem [12, 13] (but with symmetric-quasiconvex functions in place of quasiconvex functions).

The paper is organized as follows: After recalling basic facts, in particular about generalized Young measures, in Section 2, we start by showing local version of the BV-Young measure characterization at regular points in Section 3 and then at singular points in Section 4. With these local results at hand, we prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 5. The corresponding changes in BD as opposed to BV are detailed in Section 6. The final Section 7 closes the paper with the aforementioned application of the characterization result (in BV) to the splitting of generating sequences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Jan Kristensen for many stimulating discussions and for reading a preliminary version of the manuscript. The support of the Oxford Centre for Non-linear PDE through the EPSRC Science and Innovation Award to OxpDE (EP/E035027/1) is gratefully acknowledged.

2. SETUP

We define the balls $B(x, r) := x + r\mathbb{B}^d$ ($r > 0$), where $\mathbb{B}^d$ is the unit ball, and analogously the cubes $Q(x, r) := x + rQ$, where Q is a (possibly rotated) unit cube. The standard unit cube is denoted by $Q(0, 1) = (0, 1)^d$, $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega_d = |\mathbb{B}^d|$ is the volume of $\mathbb{B}^d$. The matrix space $\mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ will always be equipped with the Frobenius norm

(Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^{md}$), its unit ball and sphere are $\mathbb{B}^{m \times d}$ and $\partial\mathbb{B}^{m \times d}$, respectively. In all of the following, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes an open bounded Lipschitz domain.

2.1. BV/BD-functions and quasiconvexity. A function $u \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is said to be a function of bounded variation, $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$, if its distributional derivative Du can be represented as a finite $\mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ -valued Radon measure carried by Ω . The space BV is a non-reflexive Banach space under the norm $\|u\|_{\text{BV}} := \|u\|_{L^1} + |Du|(\Omega)$, where $|Du|$ is the total variation measure of Du . We will often use the Lebesgue–Radon–Nikodým decomposition

$$Du = \nabla u \mathcal{L}^d \llcorner \Omega + D^s u = \nabla u \mathcal{L}^d \llcorner \Omega + \frac{dD^s u}{d|D^s u|} |D^s u|,$$

where $\frac{dD^s u}{d|D^s u|} \in L^1(\Omega; \partial\mathbb{B}^{d-1})$ is the polar function of $D^s u$, i.e. the Radon–Nikodým derivative of $D^s u$ by its total variation measure $|D^s u|$. Boundedness in norm of a sequence $(u_j) \subset \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ entails weak* (sequential) compactness, i.e. one can find a subsequence (here, like in the following, not relabeled) $u_j \xrightarrow{*} u \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$, meaning that $u_j \rightarrow u$ strongly in $L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ and $Du_j \xrightarrow{*} Du$ in the sense of Radon measures. For further information on the space BV and its properties we refer to [3], other references are [10, 33].

The space BD(Ω) of functions of bounded deformation is defined similarly to BV as the collection of all functions $u \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with the property that the *symmetrized* distributional derivative Eu , defined by duality with the symmetrized gradient $\mathcal{E}u := (\nabla u + \nabla u^T)/2$, is representable as a finite $\mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{d \times d}$ -valued Radon measure. We have analogous notions of norm and convergence as in BV. The space BD was introduced in [19, 27, 28] for applications in plasticity theory, much of the theory relevant to this work is developed in [2, 32].

Starting with Morrey’s work [21], the natural notion of convexity for minimization problems involving gradients has long been known to be that of quasiconvexity. A locally bounded Borel function $f: \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be **quasiconvex** if

$$f(A) \leq \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f(A + \nabla \psi(y)) \, dy \quad \text{for all } \psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^m) \text{ and all } A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}.$$

It can be shown that in this definition one may replace $\mathbb{B}^d$ by any bounded open Lipschitz domain and the space C^∞ by $W^{1,\infty}$ without changing the definition of quasiconvexity. More about this fundamental class of functions can be found in the book [7]. We also define the quasiconvex envelope $Qh: \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ of a continuous function $h: \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be the largest quasiconvex function less than or equal to h (possibly identically $-\infty$ if no such function exists). Then, one can show that (see Section 6.3 in [7] and the appendix of [12])

$$Qh(A) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} h(A + \nabla \psi(y)) \, dy : \psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^m) \right\}, \quad (2.1)$$

which is itself a quasiconvex function or identically $-\infty$.

For *symmetrized* gradients the notion of convexity relevant for our purposes turns out to be that of symmetric-quasiconvexity: We call a bounded Borel function $f: \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ **symmetric-quasiconvex** if

$$f(A) \leq \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f(A + \mathcal{E}\psi(y)) \, dy \quad \text{for all } \psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \text{ and all } A \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{d \times d}.$$

Similar assertions to the ones for quasiconvex functions hold, cf. [9] and [5].

Finally, we recall the following rigidity lemma from [24] about BV-functions:

Lemma 2.1 (Rigidity of BV-functions). *Let $u \in \text{BV}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$ such that for a fixed matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with $|P| = 1$ it holds that*

$$Du = P|Du| \quad \text{or, equivalently,} \quad \frac{dDu}{d|Du|}(x) = P \quad \text{for } |Du|\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

Then:

- (i) *If $\text{rank } P \geq 2$, then $u(x) = u_0 + \alpha Px$ a.e., where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $u_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$.*
- (ii) *If $P = a \otimes \xi$ ($a \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$), then there exist $\psi \in \text{BV}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$, $u_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $u(x) = u_0 + \psi(x \cdot \xi)a$ a.e..*

2.2. Young measures. This section gives a brief overview of the basic theory of generalized Young measures and recalls results that will be used later. We follow [16, 24, 26], also see [25] for a more comprehensive introduction.

First, we need a suitable class of integrands: Let $\mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ be the set of all $f \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ such that

$$(Sf)(x, \hat{A}) := (1 - |\hat{A}|) f\left(x, \frac{\hat{A}}{1 - |\hat{A}|}\right), \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}, \hat{A} \in \mathbb{B}^{m \times d} \quad (2.2)$$

extends into a continuous function $Sf \in C(\overline{\Omega \times \mathbb{B}^{m \times d}})$. In particular, this implies that f has **linear growth at infinity**, i.e. with $M := \|f\|_{\mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} := \|Sf\|_{\overline{\Omega \times \mathbb{B}^{m \times d}}}$,

$$|f(x, A)| \leq M(1 + |A|) \quad \text{for all } (x, A) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}.$$

For all $f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ the **(strong) recession function**

$$f^\infty(x, A) := \lim_{\substack{x' \rightarrow x \\ A' \rightarrow A \\ t \rightarrow \infty}} \frac{f(x', tA')}{t}, \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}, A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}, \quad (2.3)$$

exists as a continuous function. Sometimes this notion of a recession function is too strong and so for any function $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ with linear growth at infinity we define the **generalized recession function**

$$h^\#(A) := \limsup_{\substack{A' \rightarrow A \\ t \rightarrow \infty}} \frac{h(tA')}{t}, \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}, A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}.$$

We remark that in both flavors of recession function one can drop the additional sequence $A' \rightarrow A$ if the integrand in question is Lipschitz continuous (which will be the case for all integrands h for which we consider $h^\#$).

A **(generalized) Young measure** with target space $\mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ is a triple $\nu = (\nu_x, \lambda_\nu, \nu_x^\infty)$ comprising

- (i) a parametrized family of probability measures $(\nu_x)_{x \in \Omega} \subset \mathbf{M}^1(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$,
- (ii) a positive finite measure $\lambda_\nu \in \mathbf{M}^+(\overline{\Omega})$ and
- (iii) a parametrized family of probability measures $(\nu_x^\infty)_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} \subset \mathbf{M}^1(\partial \mathbb{B}^{m \times d})$ (recall that $\partial \mathbb{B}^{m \times d}$ contains all matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with $|A| = 1$).

Moreover, we assume that ν has the following properties:

- (iv) the map $x \mapsto \nu_x$ is weakly* measurable with respect to $\mathcal{L}^d$, i.e. the function $x \mapsto \langle f(x, \cdot), \nu_x \rangle$ is $\mathcal{L}^d$ -measurable for all bounded Borel functions $f: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,
- (v) the map $x \mapsto \nu_x^\infty$ is weakly* measurable with respect to λ_ν , and
- (vi) $x \mapsto \langle |\cdot|, \nu_x \rangle \in L^1(\Omega)$.

We collect all such Young measures ν in the set $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$. The parametrized measure (ν_x) is called the **oscillation measure**, the measure λ_ν is the **concentration measure**, and (ν_x^∞) is the **concentration-angle measure**; this terminology is illustrated in [16] and [25].

The **duality product** $\langle\langle f, \nu \rangle\rangle$ for $f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ and $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ is defined via

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle f, \nu \rangle\rangle &:= \int_{\Omega} \langle f(x, \cdot), \nu_x \rangle dx + \int_{\Omega} \langle f^\infty(x, \cdot), \nu_x^\infty \rangle d\lambda_\nu(x) \\ &:= \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{m \times d}} f(x, A) d\nu_x(A) dx + \int_{\Omega} \int_{\partial \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}} f^\infty(x, A) d\nu_x^\infty(A) d\lambda_\nu(x). \end{aligned}$$

One can see easily that $\langle\langle \cdot, \nu \rangle\rangle$ for $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ defines a linear and bounded functional on the Banach space $\mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$. Hence, via $\langle\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\rangle$, a Young measure can be considered a part of the dual space $\mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})^*$. This embedding gives rise to a weak* topology on $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ and so we say that $(\nu_j) \subset \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ weakly* converges to $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$, $\nu_j \xrightarrow{*} \nu$, if $\langle\langle f, \nu_j \rangle\rangle \rightarrow \langle\langle f, \nu \rangle\rangle$ for all $f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$.

The main compactness result in the space $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ states that if $(\nu_j) \subset \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ is a sequence of Young measures such that

$$\sup_j \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu_j \rangle\rangle < \infty,$$

then (ν_j) is weakly* sequentially relatively compact in $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$, i.e. there exists a subsequence (not relabeled) such that $\nu_j \xrightarrow{*} \nu$ for a $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$. It can also be shown that the set $\mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ is weakly* closed (as a subset of $\mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})^*$).

Another important notion is that of the **barycenter**

$$[\nu] := \langle \text{id}, \nu_x \rangle \mathcal{L}_x^d \llcorner \Omega + \langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle \lambda_\nu(x) \in \mathbf{M}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$$

of a Young measure $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$.

The following technical lemma is often useful:

Lemma 2.2. *There exists a countable set of functions $\{f_k\} = \{\varphi_k \otimes h_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$, where $\varphi_k \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ and $h_k \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$, such that $\langle\langle f_k, \nu_1 \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle f_k, \nu_2 \rangle\rangle$ for $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ implies $\nu_1 = \nu_2$. Moreover, all the h_k can be chosen to be Lipschitz continuous and we may also require that every h_k is either compactly supported in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ or positively 1-homogeneous.*

Next, we define the set $\mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ of **gradient Young measures** as the collection of the Young measures $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ with the property that there exists a norm-bounded sequence $(u_j) \subset \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ with $Du_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \nu$, meaning that

$$\int_{\Omega} f(x, \nabla u_j(x)) dx + \int_{\Omega} f^\infty\left(x, \frac{dD^s u_j}{d|D^s u_j|}\right) d|D^s u_j|(x) \rightarrow \langle\langle f, \nu \rangle\rangle$$

for all $f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$.

In complete analogy to $\mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ one can define the sets $\mathbf{BDY}(\Omega)$ of **BD-Young measures**, i.e. of those Young measures $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{d \times d})$ that can be generated by the symmetrized derivatives Eu_j of a norm-bounded sequence of BD-functions $(u_j) \subset \text{BD}(\Omega)$, that is, $Eu_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \nu$. All of the following results, with the appropriate changes, are also valid in this situation.

The following lemma is of a technical nature and will be used frequently:

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ satisfy $\lambda_\nu(\partial\Omega) = 0$. Then, there exists a generating sequence $(u_j) \subset (W^{1,1} \cap C^\infty)(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ with $Du_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \nu$ and $u_j|_{\partial\Omega} = u|_{\partial\Omega}$, where $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is an arbitrary underlying deformation of ν , that is, u satisfies $[\nu] \llcorner \Omega = Du$.*

Next, we recall ways to manipulate (gradient) Young measures. These results encapsulate the basic operations that are customarily performed on sequences in the Calculus of Variations, see [26] for proofs.

Proposition 2.4 (Averaging). *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ satisfy $\lambda_\nu(\partial\Omega) = 0$. Also, assume that $[\nu] = Du$ for a function $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ satisfying one of the following two properties:*

- (i) *u agrees with an affine function on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ or*
- (ii) *Ω is a cuboid with one face normal $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and one (hence every) underlying deformation of ν is ξ -directional.*

Then, there exists a Young measure $\bar{\nu} \in \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ acting on $f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle f, \bar{\nu} \rangle\rangle &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \langle f(x, \cdot), \nu_y \rangle \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda_\nu(\bar{\Omega})}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\bar{\Omega}} \langle f^\infty(x, \cdot), \nu_y^\infty \rangle \, d\lambda_\nu(y) \, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

More precisely:

- (i) *The oscillation measure $(\bar{\nu}_x)_x$ is $\mathcal{L}^d$ -essentially constant in x and for all $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ with linear growth at infinity it holds that*

$$\langle h, \bar{\nu}_x \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \langle h, \nu_y \rangle \, dy \quad a.e.$$

- (ii) *The concentration measure $\lambda_{\bar{\nu}}$ is a multiple of Lebesgue measure, $\lambda_{\bar{\nu}} = \alpha \mathcal{L}^d \llcorner \Omega$, where $\alpha = \lambda_\nu(\bar{\Omega})/|\Omega|$.*
- (iii) *The concentration-angle measure $(\bar{\nu}_x^\infty)_x$ is $\mathcal{L}^d$ -essentially ($\lambda_{\bar{\nu}}$ -essentially) constant and for all $h^\infty \in C(\partial\mathbb{B}^{m \times d})$ it holds that*

$$\langle h^\infty, \bar{\nu}_x^\infty \rangle = \int_{\bar{\Omega}} \langle h^\infty, \nu_y^\infty \rangle \, d\lambda_\nu(y) \quad a.e.$$

Here, the ξ -directionality of an underlying deformation $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$, i.e. $[\nu] = Du$, means that $u(x) = v(x \cdot \xi)$ with $v \in \text{BV}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^m)$. The proof of case (i) is contained in Proposition 7 of [16], the proof of (ii) is similar, but requires an additional standard staircase construction.

Applying the averaging principle to a fixed function (or, more precisely, an elementary Young measure) yields the following corollary, which we here give in the slightly extended form with a different domain to be covered.

Corollary 2.5 (Generalized Riemann–Lebesgue Lemma). *Let $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ that agrees with an affine function on $\partial\Omega$. Then, for ever open bounded Lipschitz domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}(D; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ that acts on $f \in \mathbf{E}(D; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ as*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle f, \nu \rangle\rangle &= \int_D \int_{\Omega} f(x, \nabla u(y)) \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad + \frac{|E^s u|(\Omega)}{|\Omega|} \int_D \int_{\Omega} f^\infty\left(x, \frac{dE^s u}{d|E^s u|}(y)\right) \, d|E^s u|(y) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\lambda_\nu(\partial\Omega) = 0$.

We will also need the following approximation result:

Proposition 2.6 (Approximation). *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ satisfy $\lambda_\nu(\partial\Omega) = 0$. Also, assume that $[\nu] = Du$ for a function $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ satisfying one of the conditions (i),*

(ii) from Proposition 2.4. Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a partition $(C_{kl})_l$ of $(\mathcal{L}^d + \lambda_\nu)$ -almost all of $\overline{\Omega}$ into open sets C_{kl} , $l = 1, \dots, N(k)$, with diameters at most $1/k$ and $(\mathcal{L}^d + \lambda_\nu)(\partial C_{kl}) = 0$, and a sequence of Young measures $(\nu_k) \subset \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ such that

$$\nu_k \xrightarrow{*} \nu \quad \text{in } \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

and for every $f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle f, \nu_k \rangle\rangle &= \sum_{l=1}^{N(k)} \langle\langle f, \overline{\nu \llcorner C_{kl}} \rangle\rangle \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{N(k)} \int_{C_{kl}} \int_{C_{kl}} \langle f(x, \cdot), \nu_y \rangle \, dy \, dx \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^{N(k)} \frac{\lambda_\nu(C_{kl})}{|C_{kl}|} \int_{C_{kl}} \int_{C_{kl}} \langle f^\infty(x, \cdot), \nu_y^\infty \rangle \, d\lambda_\nu(y) \, dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{\nu \llcorner C_{kl}}$ designates the averaged Young measures to $\nu \llcorner C_{kl}$ as in Proposition 2.4.

The final results we need to recall about Young measures are the following localization principles, first proved in [24, 26], we here present the versions from [25]. For the statements of these propositions we use the notion of a **local (gradient) Young measure** $\nu \in [\mathbf{G}] \mathbf{Y}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$, which is defined on all of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and whose restriction lies in $[\mathbf{G}] \mathbf{Y}(U; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ for any relatively compact set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proposition 2.7 (Localization at regular points). *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ be a gradient Young measure. Then, for $\mathcal{L}^d$ -almost every $x_0 \in \Omega$ there exists a **regular tangent Young measure** $\sigma \in \mathbf{GY}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} [\sigma] &\in \text{Tan}([\nu], x_0), & \sigma_y &= \nu_{x_0} \quad a.e., \\ \lambda_\sigma &= \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x_0) \mathcal{L}^d \in \text{Tan}(\lambda_\nu, x_0), & \sigma_y^\infty &= \nu_{x_0}^\infty \quad a.e. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.8 (Localization at singular points). *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ be a gradient Young measure. Then, for λ_ν^s -almost every $x_0 \in \Omega$, there exists a **singular tangent Young measure** $\sigma \in \mathbf{GY}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ satisfying*

$$[\sigma] \in \text{Tan}([\nu], x_0), \quad \sigma_y = \delta_0 \quad a.e., \quad (2.5)$$

$$\lambda_\sigma \in \text{Tan}(\lambda_\nu^s, x_0) \setminus \{0\}, \quad \sigma_y^\infty = \nu_{x_0}^\infty \quad \lambda_\sigma\text{-a.e.} \quad (2.6)$$

3. LOCAL CHARACTERIZATION I: REGULAR POINTS

We first prove a local version of our characterization theorem in BV at regular points, that is for Young measures originating from the regular localization procedure of Proposition 2.7. This proof is based on the same principles as the one for classical Young measures in [12, 13]. Let

$$\mathbf{E}^{\text{reg}} := \{ \mathbb{1} \otimes h : \mathbb{1} \otimes h \in \mathbf{E}(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}) \},$$

and for $A_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y}^{\text{reg}}(A_0) &:= \left\{ \nu \in \mathbf{Y}(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}) : [\nu] = A_0 \mathcal{L}^d \llcorner \mathbb{B}^d, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \nu_y, \nu_y^\infty \text{ constant in } y, \lambda_\nu = \alpha \mathcal{L}^d \llcorner \mathbb{B}^d \text{ for } \alpha \geq 0 \right\}, \\ \mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(A_0) &:= \mathbf{Y}^{\text{reg}}(A_0) \cap \mathbf{GY}(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}) \\ &= \left\{ \nu \in \mathbf{Y}^{\text{reg}}(A_0) : \exists (v_j) \subset \text{BV}(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^m) \text{ with } Dv_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \nu \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In analogy to the terminology for classical Young measures, we call elements of $\mathbf{Y}^{\text{reg}}(A_0)$ **homogeneous** Young measures (since they do not depend on the domain $\mathbb{B}^d$).

Then, via the usual duality pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, the space $\mathbf{Y}^{\text{reg}}(A_0)$ can be considered as a part of the dual space to $\mathbf{E}^{\text{reg}}$. Moreover, the space of test functions $\mathbf{E}^{\text{reg}}$ is *separating* for $\mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(A_0)$, that is, for $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathbf{Y}^{\text{reg}}(A_0)$,

$$\langle f, \nu_1 \rangle = \langle f, \nu_2 \rangle \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathbf{E}^{\text{reg}} \quad \text{implies} \quad \nu_1 = \nu_2,$$

as can be easily checked.

Lemma 3.1. *Considered as a subset of the dual space $(\mathbf{E}^{\text{reg}})^*$, the set $\mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(A_0)$ is weakly* closed and convex.*

Proof. Both assertions follow similarly to Lemma 4.1 below (most arguments are in fact easier), once observing that here we even have an affine underlying deformation, which is admissible in the averaging principle, Proposition 2.4. $\square$

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}^{\text{reg}}(A_0)$ for some $A_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$. If ν satisfies the regular Jensen-type inequality*

$$h(A_0) = h\left(\langle \text{id}, \nu_y \rangle + \langle \text{id}, \nu_y^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(y)\right) \leq \langle h, \nu_y \rangle + \langle h^\#, \nu_y^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(y) \quad (3.1)$$

for all quasiconvex $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ with linear growth at infinity, then $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(A_0)$.

Proof. Step 1. From Lemma 3.1 we know that the set $\mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(A_0)$ is weakly* closed and convex (considered as a subset of $(\mathbf{E}^{\text{reg}})^*$). By the Hahn–Banach Theorem we therefore only need to show that for every weakly* closed affine half-space H in $(\mathbf{E}^{\text{reg}})^*$ with $\mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(A_0) \subset H$, it holds that $\nu \in H$. Fix such a half-space H and observe that since H is weakly* closed, there exists a weakly* continuous functional $G_H \in (\mathbf{E}^{\text{reg}})^*$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$H = \{ e^* \in \mathbf{E}^{\text{reg}} : G_H(e^*) \geq \kappa \}.$$

From standard arguments in Functional Analysis, see for example Theorem V.1.3 in [6], we may infer that G_H is an evaluation functional, $G_H(e^*) = e^*(f_H)$ for an $f_H \in \mathbf{E}^{\text{reg}}$. In particular, as $\mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(A_0) \subset H$, we have

$$\langle f_H, \mu \rangle \geq \kappa \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(A_0).$$

In the remainder of the proof we will show $\langle f_H, \nu \rangle \geq \kappa$, whereby $\nu \in H$.

Step 2. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For

$$g_\varepsilon(A) := f_H(A) + \varepsilon |A|, \quad A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d},$$

we immediately see $g_\varepsilon \in \mathbf{E}^{\text{reg}}$. Also,

$$\langle f_H, \nu \rangle = \langle g_\varepsilon, \nu \rangle - \varepsilon \langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle. \quad (3.2)$$

Next, we observe that $Qf_H(A_0) > -\infty$, where Qf_H is the quasiconvex envelope of f_H . Otherwise, there exists $w \in W_{A_0x}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f_H(\nabla w(y)) \, dy < \kappa,$$

and using the generalized Riemann–Lebesgue Lemma, Corollary 2.5, we infer the existence of $\mu \in \mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(A_0)$ with $\langle\langle f_H, \mu \rangle\rangle < \kappa$, a contradiction. Also, by the formula (2.1) for the quasiconvex envelope in conjunction with the (classical) Jensen inequality,

$$Qg_\varepsilon(A_0) \geq Qf_H(A_0) + \varepsilon|A_0| > -\infty.$$

Since it is not identically $-\infty$, the function Qg_ε is quasiconvex, this is proved for example in the appendix of [12]. Next, from $Qg_\varepsilon \leq g_\varepsilon$ we infer the upper bound $Qg_\varepsilon(A) \leq (M+1)(1+|A|)$. Because $Qg_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ is separately convex and finite by the above reasoning, Lemma 2.5 in [15] implies that also $|Qg_\varepsilon(A)| \leq \tilde{M}(1+|A|)$ for some $\tilde{M} > 0$ that depends on the dimensions m, d , the growth bound $M+1$ and on $Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, 0) \leq f(z_k, 0) \leq M$.

Using $g_\varepsilon \geq Qg_\varepsilon$, $g_\varepsilon^\infty \geq (Qg_\varepsilon)^\#$, and employing the assumption (3.1) we get

$$\langle\langle g_\varepsilon, \nu \rangle\rangle \geq \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} \langle Qg_\varepsilon, \nu_y \rangle + \langle (Qg_\varepsilon)^\#, \nu_y^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(y) \, dy \geq Qg_\varepsilon(A_0)\omega_d. \quad (3.3)$$

The formula (2.1) for the quasiconvex envelope yields a sequence $(w_j) \subset W_{A_0x}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$ with

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}^d} g_\varepsilon(\nabla w_j(y)) \, dy \rightarrow Qg_\varepsilon(A_0)\omega_d.$$

Moreover, by quasiconvexity of Qf_H and possibly discarding leading elements of the sequence (w_j) ,

$$\begin{aligned} Qg_\varepsilon(A_0) + 1 &\geq \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} g_\varepsilon(\nabla w_j(y)) \, dy \geq \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} Qf_H(\nabla w_j(y)) + \varepsilon|\nabla w_j(y)| \, dy \\ &\geq Qf_H(A_0) + \frac{\varepsilon}{\omega_d} \|\nabla w_j\|_{L^1(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the Poincaré–Friedrichs inequality the sequence (w_j) is uniformly bounded in $W^{1,1}(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$, hence we may assume that $\nabla w_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \mu \in \mathbf{GY}(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$. Now apply the averaging principle, Proposition 2.4 to replace μ by its averaged version $\bar{\mu} \in \mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(A_0)$. From the properties of $\bar{\mu}$ and the definition of (w_j) we get

$$\langle\langle g_\varepsilon, \bar{\mu} \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle g_\varepsilon, \mu \rangle\rangle = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} g_\varepsilon(\nabla w_j(y)) \, dy = Qg_\varepsilon(A_0)\omega_d.$$

Hence, combining with (3.2) and (3.3), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle f_H, \nu \rangle\rangle &\geq Qg_\varepsilon(A_0)\omega_d - \varepsilon \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle g_\varepsilon, \bar{\mu} \rangle\rangle - \varepsilon \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle\rangle \\ &\geq \langle\langle f_H, \bar{\mu} \rangle\rangle - \varepsilon \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle\rangle \geq \kappa - \varepsilon \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the last estimate follows from $\bar{\mu} \in \mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(A_0) \subset H$. Now let $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ to conclude $\langle\langle f_H, \nu \rangle\rangle \geq \kappa$, whence $\nu \in H$. $\square$

4. LOCAL CHARACTERIZATION II: SINGULAR POINTS

At singular points $x_0 \in \Omega$ we need to distinguish several cases. Let

$$A_0 := \langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle.$$

Then, depending on whether $A_0 = a \otimes \xi$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^d$ (i.e. $\text{rank } A_0 = 1$), or $A_0 \neq a \otimes \xi$ for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (i.e. $\text{rank } A_0 \geq 2$), or $A_0 = 0$, we need to work in a different setup. From the Rigidity Lemma 2.1 we know that in the first case every tangent Young

measure σ has a concentration measure λ_σ that is one-directional in direction ξ (also called “ ξ -directional” in the following), meaning that for all $v \perp \xi$ it holds that $\lambda_\sigma(\cdot + v) = \lambda_\sigma$. In the second case we infer that the underlying deformation is a constant and since $A_0 \neq 0$, λ_σ is a constant multiple of Lebesgue measure. Finally, if $A_0 = 0$, then λ_σ is arbitrary.

4.1. The case $A_0 = a \otimes \xi$. Assume that $A_0 = a \otimes \xi$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^d$. In all of the following, Q_ξ denotes a (rotated) cube with $|Q_\xi| = 1$ and with one face orthogonal to $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. Define the space

$$\mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\xi) := \{ f \in \mathbf{E}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}) : f(y, \cdot) = f(y \cdot \xi, \cdot) \text{ and } f(y, \cdot) \text{ is positively 1-homogeneous for all } y \in Q_\xi \}.$$

Here and in the following, $f(y, \cdot) = f(y \cdot \xi, \cdot)$ means that f only depends on $y \cdot \xi$. We also set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi) &:= \{ \nu \in \mathbf{Y}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}) : [\nu] = (a \otimes \xi) \lambda_\nu, \nu_y = \delta_0 \text{ a.e.}, \\ &\quad \nu_y^\infty = \nu_{y \cdot \xi}^\infty \text{ and } \lambda_\nu \text{ is } \xi\text{-directional} \}, \\ \mathbf{GY}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi) &:= \mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi) \cap \mathbf{GY}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}), \\ [\mathbf{G}] \mathbf{Y}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi) &:= \{ \nu \in [\mathbf{G}] \mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi) : \lambda_\nu(\partial Q_\xi) = 0 \}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for all $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ any underlying deformation $u \in \text{BV}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^m)$, i.e. $[\nu] = Du$, is of the form $u(y) = u_0 + a\psi(y \cdot \xi)$ for some $u_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\psi \in \text{BV}(0, 1)$. We also observe that

$$(a \otimes \xi) \lambda_\nu = [\nu] = \langle \text{id}, \nu_y^\infty \rangle \lambda_\nu(y),$$

whereby $\langle \text{id}, \nu_y^\infty \rangle = a \otimes \xi$ is independent of y (λ_ν -a.e.).

Then, via the usual duality pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, the space $\mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ is considered a part of the dual space to $\mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\xi)$. Again, the space of test functions $\mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\xi)$ is separating for $\mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$, that is, if for $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ it holds that $\langle f, \nu_1 \rangle = \langle f, \nu_2 \rangle$ for all $f \in \mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\xi)$, then $\nu_1 = \nu_2$. This can be checked by considering elements in $\mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\xi)$ of the form $f(x, A) := \varphi(x)h(A)$ with $\varphi \in C(\overline{Q_\xi})$ satisfying $\varphi(x) = \varphi(x \cdot \xi)$, and $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ positively 1-homogeneous (use the ξ -directionality of $y \mapsto \nu_y^\infty$ and λ_ν).

Lemma 4.1. *Considered as subsets of the dual space $\mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\xi)^*$, the set $\mathbf{GY}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ is weakly* closed and the set $\mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ is convex.*

Proof. *Weak* closedness of $\mathbf{GY}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$:* Take ν from the weak* closure of $\mathbf{GY}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$. By the weak* closedness of the space of Young measures we can assume that $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$.

Take a countable set $\{f_k\} = \{\varphi_k \otimes h_k\} \subset \mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\xi)$ that determines Young measures; this can be constructed by a procedure analogous to the one in Lemma 2.2. Then, for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\nu_j \in \mathbf{GY}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ such that

$$|\langle f_k, \nu_j \rangle - \langle f_k, \nu \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{j} \quad \text{and} \quad |\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu_j \rangle - \langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{j}$$

whenever $k \leq j$. Thus, $\nu_j \xrightarrow{*} \nu$ in $\mathbf{Y}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$. Clearly, $\nu_y = \delta_0$ for $\mathcal{L}^d$ -almost every $y \in Q_\xi$. Since the Young measure convergence implies the convergence of the barycenters (as measures) and $\lambda_{\nu_j} \xrightarrow{*} \lambda_\nu$ (test with $h(A) := |A|$), we immediately get that $[\nu] = (a \otimes \xi) \lambda_\nu$.

For all $\varphi \otimes h \in \mathbf{E}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ and all $\eta \perp \xi$, we have by the translation-invariance of $y \mapsto (\nu_j)_y^\infty$ and λ_{ν_j} with respect to directions orthogonal to ξ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \varphi(y + \eta) \langle h, \nu_y^\infty \rangle d\lambda_\nu(y) &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int \varphi(y + \eta) \langle h, (\nu_j)_y^\infty \rangle d\lambda_{\nu_j}(y) \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int \varphi(y) \langle h, (\nu_j)_y^\infty \rangle d\lambda_{\nu_j}(y) \\ &= \int \varphi(y) \langle h, \nu_y^\infty \rangle d\lambda_\nu(y). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, varying φ and h , we may conclude that also $y \mapsto \nu_y^\infty$ and λ_ν are ξ -directional.

It remains to show that ν can be generated by a sequence of gradients. Since all the ν_j lie in $\mathbf{GY}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$, we know that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $u_j \in W^{1,1}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^m)$ with

$$\left| \int_Q f_k(x, \nabla u_j(x)) dx - \langle f_k, \nu_j \rangle \right| \leq \frac{1}{j}$$

and

$$|\|\nabla u_j\|_{L^1(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} - \langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu_j \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{j},$$

again for all $k \leq j$. Thus, the gradients (∇u_j) are uniformly bounded in $L^1(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ and we may add a constant to every u_j and employ Poincaré's inequality to make the sequence (u_j) uniformly bounded in $W^{1,1}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Therefore, there exists a subsequence (not relabeled) with $\nabla u_j \xrightarrow{Y} \mu \in \mathbf{GY}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$. The construction entails $\langle f_k, \mu \rangle = \langle f_k, \nu \rangle$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, hence $\mu = \nu$.

Convexity of $\mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$: Without loss of generality we may assume that $\xi = \mathbf{e}_1$, the first unit vector, and $Q = Q_\xi$. First we show that it suffices to prove the assertion for averaged measures, where by “averaged” we mean that they originate from the averaging procedure of Proposition 2.4. Indeed, the approximation principle, Proposition 2.6, entails that all Young measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ are weak* sequential limits of sequences of piecewise homogeneous and averaged gradient Young measures, i.e. $\mu = \text{w}^*\text{-}\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k$ and $\nu = \text{w}^*\text{-}\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \nu_k$, where with the notation of Proposition 2.6,

$$\langle f, \mu_k \rangle = \sum_{l=1}^{N(k)} \langle f, \overline{\mu \llcorner C_{kl}} \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle f, \nu_k \rangle = \sum_{l=1}^{N(k)} \langle f, \overline{\nu \llcorner C_{kl}} \rangle.$$

and $(\mathcal{L}^d + \lambda_\mu + \lambda_\nu)(\partial C_{kl}) = 0$ for all $l = 1, \dots, N(k)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. From the proof of said proposition in Section 5.3 of [16] we know also that for ever fixed $l \in \mathbb{N}$ the sets $(C_{kl})_k$ are cuboids (boxes) arranged in a lattice; in fact it is not difficult to see that we may choose the same open cubes (C_{kl}) for both μ and ν and such that ξ is a face normal to all the C_{kl} 's.

We will show below that the set of homogeneous, averaged gradient Young measures is convex. Assuming this for the moment, we get in particular that $\theta \overline{\mu \llcorner C_{kl}} + (1 - \theta) \overline{\nu \llcorner C_{kl}} \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ for all $\theta \in (0, 1)$, where the operation of addition is to be understood in the sense of functionals in $\mathbf{E}(Q; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})^*$. Hence, the Young measure

$$\begin{aligned} \theta \mu + (1 - \theta) \nu &= \text{w}^*\text{-}\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [\theta \mu_k + (1 - \theta) \nu_k] \\ &= \text{w}^*\text{-}\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^{N(k)} \left[\overline{\theta \mu \llcorner C_{kl}} + (1 - \theta) \overline{\nu \llcorner C_{kl}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

lies in the weakly* closed envelope of $\mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$. Indeed, note that we can glue together suitable generating sequences of the Young measures $\overline{\theta \mu \llcorner C_{kl}} + (1 - \theta) \overline{\nu \llcorner C_{kl}}$ via a standard staircase construction employing Lemma 2.3 and the one-directionality of the underlying

deformations. By the weak* closedness assertion from the first part of the lemma, we may conclude $\theta\mu + (1 - \theta)\nu \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ (note that $\lambda_{\theta\mu + (1-\theta)\nu}(\partial Q) = 0$ follows since $\lambda_\mu(\partial Q) = \lambda_\nu(\partial Q) = 0$), proving the second assertion of the present lemma.

To show convexity for the set of homogenous, averaged Young measures, let $C \subset Q$ be an open cube with $(\mathcal{L}^d + \lambda_\mu + \lambda_\nu)(\partial C) = 0$. Without loss of generality we further assume C to be the unit cube $Q(0, 1)$. Denote by $\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu} \in \mathbf{GY}(C; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ the corresponding averagings of $\mu \llcorner C$ and $\nu \llcorner C$, respectively. In particular (see (2.4)),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \varphi \otimes h, \bar{\mu} \rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes h, \mu \llcorner C \rangle\rangle \int_C \varphi(x) \, dx, \\ \langle\langle \varphi \otimes h, \bar{\nu} \rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes h, \nu \llcorner C \rangle\rangle \int_C \varphi(x) \, dx \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

for all $\varphi \in C(C)$, $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ with $\varphi \otimes h \in \mathbf{E}(C; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$. The underlying deformations of $\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu}$ are affine functions and they only depend on the direction $\xi = \mathbf{e}_1$, so say $[\bar{\mu}] = Du$, $[\bar{\nu}] = Dv$ with $u(x) = q_1 ax_1$ and $v(x) = q_2 ax_1$ for some constants $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let $\nabla u_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \bar{\mu}$ and $\nabla v_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \bar{\nu}$, where $(u_j), (v_j) \subset W^{1,1}(C; \mathbb{R}^m)$ are both uniformly $W^{1,1}$ -bounded sequences with $u_j \xrightarrow{*} u$, $v_j \xrightarrow{*} v$. By Lemma 2.3 we can also assume $u_j|_{\partial C} = u|_{\partial C}$, $v_j|_{\partial C} = v|_{\partial C}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Define

$$D := \{x \in C = Q(0, 1) : x_1 + 1/2 \leq \theta\},$$

for which it holds that $|D| = \theta|C|$. Then for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ cover $\mathcal{L}^d$ -almost all of D and $C \setminus D$ with (similar) cubes $(a_{jl} + \varepsilon_j C)_l$ and cubes $(b_{jl} + \delta_j C)_l$, respectively, where $\varepsilon_j, \delta_j \leq 1/j$. Define

$$w_j(x) := \begin{cases} \varepsilon_j u_j\left(\frac{x - a_{jl}}{\varepsilon_j}\right) + u(a_{jl}) & \text{if } x \in a_{jl} + \varepsilon_j C \ (l \in \mathbb{N}), \\ \delta_j v_j\left(\frac{x - b_{jl}}{\delta_j}\right) + v(b_{jl}) + \beta a & \text{if } x \in b_{jl} + \delta_j C \ (l \in \mathbb{N}). \end{cases}$$

Here, the constant β is chosen as to eliminate the jump between the two parts of C . The construction of w_j is such that

$$\nabla w_j(x) = \begin{cases} \nabla u_j\left(\frac{x - a_{jl}}{\varepsilon_j}\right) & \text{if } x \in a_{jl} + \varepsilon_j C \ (l \in \mathbb{N}), \\ \nabla v_j\left(\frac{x - b_{jl}}{\delta_j}\right) & \text{if } x \in b_{jl} + \delta_j C \ (l \in \mathbb{N}). \end{cases}$$

It is not difficult to see that (w_j) is still bounded in $W^{1,1}(C; \mathbb{R}^m)$ and we may assume that $\nabla w_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \gamma \in \mathbf{GY}(C; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$. Since effectively in D and $C \setminus D$ we are repeating the construction of the averaging principle, Proposition 2.4, we can deduce similarly to the proof of (2.4), see [16], that for $\varphi \in C(\bar{C})$, $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ positively 1-homogeneous (in particular $\varphi \otimes h \in \mathbf{E}(C; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \varphi \otimes h, \gamma \rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle \mathbb{1}_{\bar{C}} \otimes h, \bar{\mu} \rangle\rangle \frac{1}{|C|} \int_D \varphi(x) \, dx \\ &\quad + \langle\langle \mathbb{1}_{\bar{C}} \otimes h, \bar{\nu} \rangle\rangle \frac{1}{|C|} \int_{C \setminus D} \varphi(x) \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

More precisely, in the step of the proof of the averaging principle where we recognized the Riemann sum, we now have to multiply with $|C|$ to get the correct measure in the sum, hence the division by $|C|$ instead of taking the average in front of the integrals.

Again apply the averaging principle, Proposition 2.4, to the measure γ to get a gradient Young measure $\bar{\gamma} \in \mathbf{GY}(C; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ with action

$$\langle\langle \varphi \otimes h, \bar{\gamma} \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes h, \gamma \rangle\rangle \int_C \varphi(x) \, dx$$

for $\varphi \in C(\overline{C})$, $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ positively 1-homogeneous. By (4.2) and (4.1) (and the extended representation results in [16]),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \varphi \otimes h, \bar{\gamma} \rangle\rangle &= \left[\frac{|D|}{|C|} \langle\langle \mathbb{1}_{\overline{C}} \otimes h, \bar{\mu} \rangle\rangle + \frac{|C \setminus D|}{|C|} \langle\langle \mathbb{1}_{\overline{C}} \otimes h, \bar{\nu} \rangle\rangle \right] \int_C \varphi(x) \, dx \\ &= \left[\theta \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes h, \mu \lfloor C \rangle\rangle + (1 - \theta) \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes h, \nu \lfloor C \rangle\rangle \right] \int_C \varphi(x) \, dx \\ &= \theta \langle\langle \varphi \otimes h, \bar{\mu} \rangle\rangle + (1 - \theta) \langle\langle \varphi \otimes h, \bar{\nu} \rangle\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemma 2.2 we have that $\theta \bar{\mu} + (1 - \theta) \bar{\nu} = \bar{\gamma} \in \mathbf{GY}(C; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ (and clearly, this is a homogeneous, averaged Young measure by construction), which concludes the proof. $\square$

We can now prove a local version of Proposition 1.2 at singular points:

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{Y}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^d$. If ν satisfies the singular Jensen-type inequality*

$$g(a \otimes \xi) = g(\langle \text{id}, \nu_y^\infty \rangle) \leq \langle g, \nu_y^\infty \rangle \quad (4.3)$$

for all quasiconvex and positively 1-homogeneous $g \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ and λ_ν -almost every $y \in Q$, then $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$.

Proof. Suppose $[\nu] = Du$ for $u \in \text{BV}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^m)$ that can be written as $u(x) = a\psi(x \cdot \xi)$ with $\psi \in \text{BV}(0, 1)$.

Step 1. We employ the same Hahn–Banach argument as for regular points. It suffices to show that for every weakly* closed affine half-space H in $\mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\xi)^*$ with $\mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi) \subset H$, it holds that $\nu \in H$. By Lemma 4.1 the set $\mathbf{GY}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ is weakly* closed and $\mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ is convex, hence the Hahn–Banach Theorem implies that ν lies in the weak* closure of $\mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$, which is contained in $\mathbf{GY}^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$. This proves the proposition.

For every such half-space H we have analogously to the situation at regular points,

$$H = \{ e^* \in \mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\xi) : e^*(f_H) \geq \kappa \}$$

for some $f_H \in \mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\xi)$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$. In particular,

$$\langle\langle f_H, \mu \rangle\rangle \geq \kappa \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi).$$

The goal for the remainder of the proof is to show that $\langle\langle f_H, \nu \rangle\rangle \geq \kappa$.

Step 2. For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ define

$$g_\varepsilon(x, A) := f_H(x, A) + \varepsilon|A|, \quad x \in Q_\xi, A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}.$$

Clearly, $g_\varepsilon \in \mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\xi)$. Moreover, fix $\delta > 0$ and take a subdivision of Q_ξ into cuboid slices S_k (with a “long” face orthogonal to ξ), $k = 1, \dots, N$, satisfying

$$\lambda_\nu(\partial S_k) = 0$$

and with diameters so small that (see (2.2))

$$|Sg_\varepsilon(x, A) - Sg_\varepsilon(y, A)| \leq \delta \quad \text{whenever } x, y \in S_k \ (k \in \mathbb{N}), A \in \overline{\mathbb{B}^{m \times d}}. \quad (4.4)$$

This is possible by the uniform continuity of Sg_ε on $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\mathbb{B}^{m \times d}}$.

We claim that in each S_k we can find a point z_k such that the quasiconvex envelope $Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, \cdot)$ of $g_\varepsilon(z_k, \cdot)$ satisfies:

- (A) $Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, \cdot)$ is finite.
- (B) $Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, \cdot)$ is quasiconvex and positively 1-homogeneous (in particular, $Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, \cdot)$ has linear growth at infinity).

(C) There exists a sequence $(\psi_j^{(k)})_j \subset W_{A_0x}^{1,\infty}(S_k; \mathbb{R}^m)$ with

$$\int_{S_k} g_\varepsilon(z_k, \nabla \psi_j^{(k)}(x)) \, dx \rightarrow Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, A_0)$$

and for some universal constant $c(\varepsilon)$ (not depending on k),

$$\sup_j \|\nabla \psi_j^{(k)}\|_{L^1(S_k; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} \leq c(\varepsilon) |S_k|.$$

To prove (A), it suffices to show that $Qf_H(z_k, A_0) > -\infty$ for at least one (henceforth fixed) $z_k \in S_k$. Indeed, if this condition holds, then also $Qf_H(z_k, A) > -\infty$ for all $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ by the rank-one convexity of $Qf_H(z_k, \cdot)$ (first assumed to take values in $[-\infty, \infty)$), the upper bound $Qf_H(z_k, \cdot) \leq f_H(z_k, \cdot) \leq M(1 + |\cdot|)$, and the well-known fact that finiteness at one point implies finiteness everywhere for such functions. Next, $Qf_H(z_k, \cdot) \in \mathbb{R}$ yields, by the classical Jensen inequality and the Gauss–Green Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} Qf_H(z_k, A) + \varepsilon|A| &\leq \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} f_H(z_k, A + \nabla \psi(y)) + \varepsilon|A + \nabla \psi(y)| \, dy : \right. \\ &\quad \left. \psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^m) \right\} \\ &= Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, A) \end{aligned}$$

for all $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, so in particular $Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, \cdot) > -\infty$.

To show $Qf_H(z_k, A_0) > -\infty$ for at least one $z_k \in S_k$, we prove the stronger assertion that the set of such z_k is even dense in Q_ξ . Assume to the contrary that there exists an open slice

$$S(z_0, r) := \{x \in Q_\xi : |(x - z_0) \cdot \xi| \leq r\}$$

for $z_0 \in Q_\xi$, $r > 0$, such that $Qf_H(z, 0) = -\infty$ for all $z \in S(z_0, r)$ (in this context recall that $z \mapsto f_H(z, 0)$ only depends on $z \cdot \xi$). Then, for every $z \in S(z_0, r)$ we can find $\psi_z \in W_{A_0x}^{1,\infty}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^m)$ with

$$\int_{Q_\xi} f_H(z, \nabla \psi_z(y)) \, dy < \frac{\kappa}{|S(z_0, r)|} - 1.$$

Moreover, we may assume that the map $z \mapsto \psi_z$ depends on $z \cdot \xi$ only.

For each $z \in S(z_0, r)$ by the uniform continuity of Sf_H choose $\eta(z) = \eta(z \cdot \xi) > 0$ so small that

$$|Sf_H(x, A) - Sf_H(z, A)| \leq \left(\int_{Q_\xi} 1 + |\nabla \psi_z(y)| \, dy \right)^{-1} \quad (4.5)$$

for all $x \in S(z, \eta(z))$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$. Then, by virtue of Vitali's Covering Theorem, cover $\mathcal{L}^d$ -almost all of $S(z_0, r)$ by such slices $S_i = S(z_i, r_i) \cap S(z_0, r)$ ($i \in \mathbb{N}$) with $0 < r_i \leq \eta(z_i)$. The generalized Riemann–Lebesgue Lemma, Corollary 2.5, then yields for each i a gradient Young measure $\mu_i \in \mathbf{GY}(S_i; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ with underlying deformation $A_0x = a(x \cdot \xi)$ and satisfying

$$\langle\langle f_H, \mu_i \rangle\rangle = \int_{S_i} \int_{Q_\xi} f_H(x, \nabla \psi_{z_i}(y)) \, dy \, dx.$$

Gluing together all the generating sequences in the slices (again employing a boundary adjustment via Lemma 2.3), we infer the existence of a gradient Young measure $\mu \in$

$\mathbf{GY}(S(z_0, r); \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ acting on f_H as $\langle\langle f_H, \mu \rangle\rangle = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \langle\langle f_H, \mu_i \rangle\rangle$. By the choice of the $\eta(z_k)$ and (4.5) we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle f_H, \mu \rangle\rangle &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{S_i} \int_{Q_\xi} f_H(x, \nabla \psi_{z_i}(y)) \, dy \, dx \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\int_{Q_\xi} f_H(z_i, \nabla \psi_{z_i}(y)) \, dy + 1 \right) |S_i| < \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

From the above construction it is also clear that $\mu \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ (extending μ by the zero Young measure in $Q_\xi \setminus S(z_0, r)$), hence by assumption $\langle\langle f_H, \mu \rangle\rangle \geq \kappa$, a contradiction.

For the proof of (B), we first observe that $Qg_\epsilon(z_k, \cdot)$ is quasiconvex, this is analogous to Step 2 in the proof of Proposition 3.2. Moreover, it is not difficult to see from the formula (2.1) that positive 1-homogeneity is preserved when passing to the quasiconvex envelope. We have the upper bound $Qg_\epsilon(z_k, A) \leq g_\epsilon(z_k, A) \leq (M+1)(1+|A|)$ and also that $Qg_\epsilon(z_k, \cdot)$ is separately convex and finite. Thus, Lemma 2.5 in [15] implies that $|Qg_\epsilon(z_k, A)| \leq \tilde{M}(1+|A|)$ for a constant $\tilde{M} > 0$. Here, $\tilde{M}$ depends on the dimensions m, d , the growth bound $M+1$, and on $Qg_\epsilon(z_k, 0) \leq f(z_k, 0) \leq M$, but not on z_k .

Finally, for assertion (C) we investigate the coercivity of the functional

$$\mathcal{G}_k(\psi) := \int_{S_k} g_\epsilon(z_k, \nabla \psi(x)) \, dx, \quad \psi \in W_{A_0 x}^{1, \infty}(S_k; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Since $g_\epsilon(z_k, A) \geq Qg_\epsilon(z_k, A) \geq Qf_H(z_k, A) + \epsilon|A|$, it suffices to check coercivity of the functional with the integrand $Qf_H(z_k, \cdot) + \epsilon|\cdot|$. Let $K \in \mathbb{R}$. By quasiconvexity of $Qf_H(z_k, \cdot)$, the condition

$$K \geq \int_{S_k} Qf_H(z_k, \nabla \psi(x)) + \epsilon|\nabla \psi(x)| \, dx \geq Qf_H(z_k, A_0) + \epsilon \int_{S_k} |\nabla \psi(x)| \, dx$$

for a $\psi \in W_{A_0 x}^{1, \infty}(S_k; \mathbb{R}^m)$ implies

$$\int_{S_k} |\nabla \psi(x)| \, dx \leq \frac{|S_k|}{\epsilon} \left[K - Qf_H(z_k, A_0) \right] \leq \frac{|S_k|}{\epsilon} \left[K + \tilde{M}(1+|A_0|) \right].$$

Now let $(\psi_j) \subset W_{A_0 x}^{1, \infty}(S_k; \mathbb{R}^m)$ be a minimizing sequence for $\mathcal{G}_k$. Then, the ψ_j satisfy the first assertion in (C) and also, discarding some leading elements in the sequence (ψ_j) if necessary,

$$\int_{S_k} g_\epsilon(z_k, \nabla \psi_j(x)) \, dx \leq Qg_\epsilon(z_k, A_0) + 1 \leq \tilde{M}(1+|A_0|) + 1.$$

From the coercivity above we therefore get

$$\int_{S_k} |\nabla \psi_j(x)| \, dx \leq \frac{2\tilde{M}(1+|A_0|) + 1}{\epsilon} |S_k| =: c(\epsilon) |S_k|,$$

this is the second assertion in (C).

Step 3. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ pick $z_k \in S_k$ that satisfies the properties (A), (B), (C) above. Then, by virtue of (4.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle f_H, \nu \rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle g_\epsilon, \nu \rangle\rangle - \epsilon \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle\rangle \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{S_k} \langle g_\epsilon(y, \cdot), \nu_y^\infty \rangle \, d\lambda_\nu(y) - \epsilon \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle\rangle \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{S_k} \langle g_\epsilon(z_k, \cdot), \nu_y^\infty \rangle \, d\lambda_\nu(y) - (\epsilon + \delta) \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes (1 + |\cdot|), \nu \rangle\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Using $g_\varepsilon(z_k, \cdot) \geq Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, \cdot)$, we infer from the key assumption (4.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_k} \langle g_\varepsilon(z_k, \cdot), \nu_y^\infty \rangle d\lambda_\nu(y) &\geq \int_{S_k} \langle Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, \cdot), \nu_y^\infty \rangle d\lambda_\nu(y) \\ &\geq Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, A_0) \lambda_\nu(S_k). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

By assertion (C) above, for each k there exists a sequence $(\psi_j^{(k)})_j \subset W_{A_0x}^{1,\infty}(S_k; \mathbb{R}^m)$ with $\|\nabla \psi_j^{(k)}\|_{L^1(S_k; \mathbb{R}^m \times d)} \leq c(\varepsilon)|S_k|$ and such that

$$\int_{S_k} g_\varepsilon(z_k, \nabla \psi_j^{(k)}(x)) dx \rightarrow Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, A_0) \quad \text{for each } k = 1, \dots, N.$$

We can now apply the averaging principle as in Proposition 2.4 to this sequence and take for each k a new sequence $(w_j^{(k)}) \subset W_{A_0x}^{1,1}(S_k; \mathbb{R}^m)$, which in addition to the above recovery property (which still holds by a change of variables) satisfies $w_j^{(k)} \xrightarrow{*} A_0x = a(x \cdot \xi)$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, the measures $|\nabla w_j^{(k)}| \mathcal{L}^d \llcorner \Omega$ do not charge the boundary of S_k in the limit. So we may furthermore require $w_j^{(k)}(x)|_{\partial S_k} = A_0x$.

Recall that $\delta > 0$ was fixed above (and we chose the subdivision of Q_ξ into the slices S_k according to this parameter) and define $w^{(\delta)}: Q_\xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ as

$$w_j^{(\delta)}(x) := w_j^{(k)}(x) \frac{\lambda_\nu(S_k)}{|S_k|} + h^{(\delta)}(x \cdot \xi) \quad \text{if } x \in S_k \ (k = 1, \dots, N),$$

where $h^{(\delta)}(x \cdot \xi)$ is a staircase term in direction ξ , which is chosen precisely to annihilate the jumps otherwise incurred by the difference in $\lambda_\nu(S_k)$ between adjacent slices. Since λ_ν is one-directional in direction ξ , so is $h^{(\delta)}$. This procedure yields a sequence $(w_j^{(\delta)})_j$, which is uniformly bounded in $W^{1,1}(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^m)$ (for δ fixed) and which has the property

$$\int_{S_k} g_\varepsilon(z_k, \nabla w_j^{(\delta)}(x)) dx \rightarrow Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, A_0) \lambda_\nu(S_k) \quad \text{for every } k = 1, \dots, N. \quad (4.8)$$

The $W^{1,1}$ -uniform boundedness can be seen as follows: We have

$$\|\nabla w_j^{(\delta)}\|_{L^1(Q_\xi; \mathbb{R}^m \times d)} \leq c(\varepsilon) \lambda_\nu(Q_\xi)$$

for all j and by Poincaré's inequality this implies the boundedness of the sequence $(w_j^{(k)})$ in $W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$.

Combining all the previous arguments, from (4.6), (4.7), (4.8) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle f_H, \nu \rangle\rangle &\geq \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{S_k} \langle g_\varepsilon(z_k, \cdot), \nu_y^\infty \rangle d\lambda_\nu(y) - (\varepsilon + \delta) \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes (1 + |\cdot|), \nu \rangle\rangle \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^N Qg_\varepsilon(z_k, A_0) \lambda_\nu(S_k) - (\varepsilon + \delta) \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes (1 + |\cdot|), \nu \rangle\rangle \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^N \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S_k} g_\varepsilon(z_k, \nabla w_j^{(\delta)}(x)) dx - (\varepsilon + \delta) \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes (1 + |\cdot|), \nu \rangle\rangle \end{aligned}$$

For $\delta > 0$ fixed, separately in every slice S_k apply the averaging principle, Proposition 2.4, to the sequence $(\nabla w_j^{(\delta)})$, or, more precisely, to the generated Young measure (restricted to S_k). This Young measure exists owing to the uniform boundedness in $W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$, selecting a subsequence if necessary. This yields a homogeneous gradient Young measure $\mu^{(\delta)} \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi)$ that acts on a function $\mathbb{1} \otimes h \in \mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\xi)$ as

$$\langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes h, \mu^{(\delta)} \rangle\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^N \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S_k} h(\nabla w_j^{(\delta)}(x)) dx.$$

Combining this with the previous estimates, we further get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\langle f_H, \nu \rangle\rangle &\geq \sum_{k=1}^N \langle\langle g_\varepsilon(z_k, \cdot), \mu^{(\delta)} \lfloor S_k \rangle\rangle - (\varepsilon + \delta) \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes (1 + |\cdot|), \nu \rangle\rangle \\ &\geq \langle\langle g_\varepsilon, \mu^{(\delta)} \rangle\rangle - \delta \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes (1 + |\cdot|), \mu^{(\delta)} \rangle\rangle - (\varepsilon + \delta) \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes (1 + |\cdot|), \nu \rangle\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Now, from the δ -independent $W^{1,1}$ -bound on the functions $w_j^{(\delta)}$ (see above), we may conclude that the second term vanishes as $\delta \downarrow 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\langle f_H, \nu \rangle\rangle &\geq \limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \langle\langle g_\varepsilon, \mu^{(\delta)} \rangle\rangle - \varepsilon \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes (1 + |\cdot|), \nu \rangle\rangle \\ &\geq \limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \langle\langle f_H, \mu^{(\delta)} \rangle\rangle - \varepsilon \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes (1 + |\cdot|), \nu \rangle\rangle \\ &\geq \kappa - \varepsilon \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used that $\langle\langle f_H, \mu^{(\delta)} \rangle\rangle \geq \kappa$ since $\mu^{(\delta)} \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(a \otimes \xi) \subset H$. Finally, letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we conclude $\langle\langle f_H, \nu \rangle\rangle \geq \kappa$, i.e. $\nu \in H$. Then the Hahn–Banach argument applies and the proof is finished. $\square$

4.2. The case $\text{rank } A_0 \geq 2$. This case is in fact much easier than the previous one and we employ the spaces (with the regular unit cube $Q(0, 1) := (-1/2, 1/2)^d$)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\emptyset) &:= \{ \mathbb{1} \otimes h \in \mathbf{E}(Q(0, 1); \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}) : h \text{ is positively 1-homogeneous} \}, \\ \mathbf{Y}_0^{\text{sing}}(A_0) &:= \{ \nu \in \mathbf{Y}(Q(0, 1); \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}) : [\nu] = A_0 \lambda_\nu, \nu_y = \delta_0 \text{ a.e.}, \\ &\quad \nu_y^\infty \text{ constant in } y, \lambda_\nu = \alpha \mathcal{L}^d \lfloor Q(0, 1) \text{ for } \alpha \geq 0. \}, \\ \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(A_0) &:= \mathbf{Y}_0^{\text{sing}}(A_0) \cap \mathbf{GY}(Q(0, 1); \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}).\end{aligned}$$

For $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(A_0)$ with $\text{rank } A_0 \geq 2$ any underlying deformation $u \in \text{BV}(Q(0, 1); \mathbb{R}^m)$ of ν , i.e. $[\nu] = Du$, is affine. The argument in the present case then proceeds in a very similar fashion to the regular case in Section 3 (with a few ingredients from Section 4.1) and we omit the details. The result is the following:

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\sigma \in \mathbf{Y}_0^{\text{sing}}(A_0)$, where $\text{rank } A_0 \geq 2$. If*

$$g(A_0) = g(\langle \text{id}, \sigma_y^\infty \rangle) \leq \langle g, \sigma_y^\infty \rangle$$

for all quasiconvex and positively 1-homogeneous $g \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ and λ_σ -almost every $y \in Q(0, 1)$, then $\sigma \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(A_0)$.

4.3. The case $A_0 = 0$. In this case, we cannot infer anything about the concentration measure (e.g. one-directionality or that it is a constant multiple of the Lebesgue measure). But since the underlying deformation is zero, the gluing procedures of Section 4.1 still work in principle. Therefore, we can proceed via the same strategy, but working in the following spaces:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}^{\text{sing}}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}) &:= \{ f \in \mathbf{E}(Q(0, 1); \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}) : f(y, \cdot) \text{ is positively 1-homogeneous} \\ &\quad \text{for all } y \in Q(0, 1) \}, \\ \mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(0) &:= \{ \nu \in \mathbf{Y}(Q(0, 1); \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}) : [\nu] = 0, \nu_y = \delta_0 \text{ a.e.} \}, \\ \mathbf{GY}^{\text{sing}}(0) &:= \mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(0) \cap \mathbf{GY}(Q(0, 1); \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}), \\ [\mathbf{G}]\mathbf{Y}_0^{\text{sing}}(0) &:= \{ \nu \in [\mathbf{G}]\mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(0) : \lambda_\nu(\partial Q(0, 1)) = 0 \}.\end{aligned}$$

The result, for which again we omit the proof, is the following:

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\sigma \in \mathbf{Y}_0^{\text{sing}}(0)$. If*

$$0 = g(0) = g(\langle \text{id}, \sigma_y^\infty \rangle) \leq \langle g, \sigma_y^\infty \rangle$$

for all quasiconvex and positively 1-homogeneous $g \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ and λ_σ -almost every $y \in Q(0, 1)$, then $\sigma \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(0)$.

5. PROOF OF THE BV CHARACTERIZATION THEOREM

We are now in a position to prove Proposition 1.2 and thus Theorem 1.1. So let ν be a Young measure as in the statement of this proposition.

Step 1. We first look at regular points. By Proposition 2.7, at $\mathcal{L}^d$ -almost every point $x_0 \in \Omega$, there exists a regular tangent Young measure $\sigma \in \mathbf{Y}^{\text{reg}}(A_0)$ to ν at x_0 , where

$$A_0 := \langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0} \rangle + \langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x_0).$$

Let $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ be quasiconvex with linear growth at infinity. By the properties of σ (notice in particular that $\frac{d\lambda_\sigma}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(y) = \text{const} = \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x_0)$ a.e.), and assumption (i) in the statement of Theorem 1.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} h\left(\langle \text{id}, \sigma_y \rangle + \langle \text{id}, \sigma_y^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\sigma}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(y)\right) &= h\left(\langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0} \rangle + \langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x_0)\right) \\ &\leq \langle h, \nu_{x_0} \rangle + \langle h^\#, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x_0) \\ &= \langle h, \sigma_y \rangle + \langle h^\#, \sigma_y^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\sigma}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(y) \end{aligned}$$

for $\mathcal{L}^d$ -almost every $y \in \mathbb{B}^d$. Hence, (3.1) is satisfied, and we may apply Proposition 3.2 to infer that σ is a regular gradient Young measure, $\sigma \in \mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(A_0)$.

From the construction of σ in the localization principle at regular points (cf. [25, 26]), we infer that $\sigma = \text{w}^*\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma^{(r_n)}$ for a sequence $r_n \downarrow 0$, where $\sigma^{(r_n)}$ is given by

$$\langle\langle \varphi \otimes h, \sigma^{(r_n)} \rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{r_n^d} \langle\langle \varphi\left(\frac{\cdot - x_0}{r_n}\right) \otimes h, \nu \rangle\rangle, \quad \varphi \otimes h \in \mathbf{E}(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}).$$

In particular, since ν has underlying deformation $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$, the Young measure $\sigma^{(r_n)}$ can be assumed to have the underlying deformation

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(n)}(y) &= \frac{u(x_0 + r_n y) - \tilde{u}(x_0)}{r_n}, \quad y \in \mathbb{B}^d, \quad \text{so} \\ Du^{(n)} &= r_n^{-d} T_*^{(x_0, r_n)} Du, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{u}(x_0)$ is the value of the precise representative of u at x_0 and $T_*^{(x_0, r_n)} Du := Du(x_0 + r_n \cdot)$ is the pushforward of Du under the affine transformation $T^{(x_0, r_n)}(x) := (x - x_0)/r_n$. We have $Du^{(n)} \xrightarrow{*} [\sigma] = Dv$ for $v(y) := \nabla u(x_0)y$. Additionally, we even have $u^{(n)} \rightarrow v$ with respect to the so-called strict convergence, meaning that $|Du^{(n)}|(\mathbb{B}^d) \rightarrow |Dv|(\mathbb{B}^d)$. This can be seen once again from the proof of the regular localization principle. More precisely, by the assumptions in the proof of said result,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |Du^{(n)}|(\mathbb{B}^d) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|Du|(B(x_0, r_n))}{r_n^d} = \omega_d \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|Du|(B(x_0, r_n))}{|B(x_0, r_n)|} \\ &= \omega_d |\nabla u(x_0)| = |Dv|(\mathbb{B}^d). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the strict continuity of the trace operator, see Section 3.8 in [3], implies

$$\int_{\partial \mathbb{B}^d} |v - u^{(n)}| d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Let $(v_j) \subset W^{1,1}(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$ be a norm-bounded generating sequence of σ that additionally satisfies $v_j|_{\partial\mathbb{B}^d} = v|_{\partial\mathbb{B}^d}$ (this can always be achieved by Lemma 2.3). Set

$$v_j^{(n)}(x) := r_n v_j\left(\frac{x - x_0}{r_n}\right) + \tilde{u}(x_0), \quad x \in B(x_0, r_n). \quad (5.1)$$

The above considerations yield by a change of variables,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial B(x_0, r_n)} |v_j^{(n)} - u| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} &= r_n^{d-1} \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}^d} |r_n v(y) - u(x_0 + r_n y) + \tilde{u}(x_0)| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \\ &= r_n^d \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}^d} |v - u^{(n)}| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = r_n^d o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Here, $o(1)$ stands for a quantity that vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (or, equivalently, $r_n \downarrow 0$).

Step 2. Turning our attention to singular points, we get from Proposition 2.8 that at λ_ν -almost every $x_0 \in \Omega$ we can find a singular tangent Young measure $\sigma \in \mathbf{GY}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ to ν at x_0 . Any underlying deformation $v \in \text{BV}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$ of σ satisfies $Dv = P_0 |Dv|$ for a fixed $P_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, this in fact is a generic property of blow-ups, see for example Proposition 3.2 in [25]. Hence, the premises of the Rigidity Lemma 2.1 are fulfilled and so it follows that $\sigma \in \mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(A_0)$ for one of the spaces $\mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(\dots)$ from Section 4 and

$$A_0 := \langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle.$$

Of course, $\sigma \in \mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(A_0)$ really means that the restriction of σ to the appropriate cube Q lies in $\mathbf{Y}^{\text{sing}}(A_0)$, where $Q = Q_\xi(0, 1)$ (the cube with one face orthogonal to $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$) if $A_0 = a \otimes \xi$ (with $a \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$), or the usual unit cube $Q = Q(0, 1)$ otherwise (this includes the case $A_0 = 0$). Moreover, since we started from a tangent Young measure on all of $\mathbb{R}^d$, we may even assume $\sigma \in \mathbf{Y}_0^{\text{sing}}(A_0)$, i.e. $\lambda_\sigma(\partial Q) = 0$, by a rescaling argument.

Let $g \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ be quasiconvex and positively 1-homogeneous. Then, from (2.5), (2.6) and assumption (ii) in Theorem 1.1 we get

$$g(\langle \text{id}, \sigma_y^\infty \rangle) = g(\langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle) \leq \langle g, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle = \langle g, \sigma_y^\infty \rangle$$

for λ_σ -almost every $y \in Q$. Therefore, one of the three Propositions 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 (which particular one is applicable depends on A_0) implies that σ is a gradient Young measure, $\sigma \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(A_0)$.

Again, σ is the weak* limit of Young measures $\sigma^{(r_n)}$ for a sequence $r_n \downarrow 0$, where the $\sigma^{(r_n)}$ are given by

$$\langle \varphi \otimes h, \sigma^{(r_n)} \rangle = c_n \left\langle \varphi\left(\frac{\cdot - x_0}{r_n}\right) \otimes h, \nu \right\rangle, \quad c_n = \frac{1}{\langle \mathbb{1}_{Q(x_0, r_n)} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle},$$

for all $\varphi \otimes h \in \mathbf{E}(Q; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$. In particular, for the underlying deformation $u_n \in \text{BV}(Q; \mathbb{R}^m)$ of $\sigma^{(r_n)}$ we may choose

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(n)}(y) &= r_n^{d-1} c_n (u(x_0 + r_n y) - \bar{u}^{(n)}), \quad y \in Q, \quad \text{so} \\ Du^{(n)} &= c_n T_*^{(x_0, r_n)} Du, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{u}^{(n)} := \int_{Q(x_0, r_n)} u \, dx$. Moreover, we can assume that $u^{(n)} \rightarrow v$ strictly. This follows since $|Du^{(n)}| \xrightarrow{*} |Dv|$ by properties of blow-ups (see Proposition 3.2 in [25]) and also $|Dv|(\partial Q) \leq \lambda_\sigma(\partial Q) = 0$, hence $|Du^{(n)}|(Q) \rightarrow |Dv|(Q)$ by standard results in measure theory. In this context, also see Lemma 3.1 in [24].

For a generating sequence $(v_j) \subset W^{1,1}(Q; \mathbb{R}^m)$ of σ with the additional property $v_j|_{\partial Q} = v|_{\partial Q}$, we define

$$v_j^{(n)}(x) := \frac{1}{r_n^{d-1} c_n} v_j\left(\frac{x - x_0}{r_n}\right) + \bar{u}^{(n)}, \quad x \in Q(x_0, r_n). \quad (5.3)$$

By the strict continuity of the trace operator, we may therefore derive

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial Q(x_0, r_n)} |v_j^{(n)} - u| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} &= r_n^{d-1} \int_{\partial Q} |r_n^{1-d} c_n^{-1} v(y) - u(x_0 + r_n y) + \bar{u}^{(n)}| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{c_n} \int_{\partial Q} |v - u^{(n)}| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = c_n^{-1} o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. We collect all regular points from Step 1 in the set $R \subset \Omega$ and all singular points from Step 2 in the set $S \subset \Omega$ (we can assume that both R and S are Borel sets). Then $(\mathcal{L}^d + \lambda_\nu)(\Omega \setminus (R \cup S)) = 0$ and R, S are disjoint. Further, take a Young measure-determining set of integrands $\{\varphi_\ell \otimes h_\ell\}_\ell \subset \mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ as in Lemma 2.2.

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $x \in R$, there exists a regular tangent Young measure $\sigma = \sigma_x \in \mathbf{GY}^{\text{reg}}(\langle \text{id}, \nu_x \rangle + \langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x))$, which is generated by a sequence $(v_j) \subset W^{1,1}(\mathbb{B}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$ as in Step 1 (of course, σ and (v_j) depend on x , but here and in the following we often suppress this dependence for ease of notation if x is fixed and clear from the context); we also consider $v_j^{(n)}$ as defined in (5.1). Pick $N = N(x) \in \mathbb{N}$ so large that for $n \geq N$ and all $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\int_{\partial B(x, r_n)} |v_j^{(n)} - u| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \leq \frac{1}{k} \langle \mathbb{1}_{B(x, r_n)} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle.$$

This is possible by (5.2) and the fact that $\langle \mathbb{1}_{B(x, r)} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle$ for $x \in R$ asymptotically behaves like r^d as $r \downarrow 0$ (this, again, can be seen from the proof of the regular localization principle).

Similarly, for all $x \in S$, Step 2 showed the existence of a singular tangent Young measure $\sigma = \sigma_x \in \mathbf{GY}_0^{\text{sing}}(\langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle) \subset \mathbf{Y}(Q; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$, which is generated by a sequence $(v_j) \subset W^{1,1}(Q; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Here, Q is either $Q_\xi(0, 1)$ if $\langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle = a \otimes \xi$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, or the usual unit cube $Q(0, 1)$ otherwise. For $v_j^{(n)}$ as defined in (5.3), there again is $N = N(x) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq N$ we have

$$\int_{\partial Q(x, r_n)} |v_j^{(n)} - u| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \leq \frac{1}{c_n k} = \frac{1}{k} \langle \mathbb{1}_{Q(x, r_n)} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle.$$

The collection of sets $B(x, r_n)$ for $x \in R$, and $Q_{\xi(x)}(x, r_n)$ for $x \in S$ with $r_n \in (0, 1/k)$ small enough such that $n \geq N(x)$, is a cover of $R \cup S$ that satisfies the assumptions of the Morse Covering Theorem [22] (cited as Theorem 5.51 in [3]). Hence, by said theorem, we may find a countable collection $(K_i(a_i, r_i))_i$ that covers Ω up to an $(\mathcal{L}^d + \lambda_\nu)$ -negligible set, where $K_i(a_i, r_i) := a_i + r_i K_i$ and K_i is either the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^d$ if $a_i \in R$, or an (a_i) -specific cube $Q_i = Q_{\xi(a_i)}(a)$ if $a_i \in S$, and r_i is such that $r_i = r_n(a_i)$ for some $n \geq N(a_i)$. Here, $r_n(a_i)$ refers to the r_n associated with the point a_i , similarly for $N_i = N(a_i)$, $\sigma_i = \sigma(a_i)$ and $c_i = c_n(a_i)$; in particular, we denote the (regular or singular) tangent Young measure at the point a_i by σ_i . At singular points $a_i \in S$ we may additionally require that

$$\lambda_\nu(\partial Q_i) = 0, \quad \lambda_{\sigma_i}(\partial Q) = 0$$

and

$$|\lambda_{\sigma_i}(Q_i) - (c_i T_*^{(a_i, r_i)} \lambda_\nu^s)(Q_i)| \leq \frac{1}{k}. \quad (5.4)$$

The last condition can be satisfied because $c_n T_*^{(a_i, r_n)} \lambda_\nu^s \xrightarrow{*} \lambda_{\sigma_i}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Denote the generating sequence of σ_i by $(v_j^{(i)})_j \subset W^{1,1}(K_i; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Then we choose $j(i, k)$ so large that

$$\left| \int_{K_i} h_\ell(\nabla v_{j(i, k)}^{(i)}(x)) \, dx - \langle \mathbb{1}_{K_i} \otimes h_\ell, \sigma_i \rangle \right| \leq \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{for all } \ell \leq k. \quad (5.5)$$

Define

$$w_k(x) := \begin{cases} r_i v_{j(i,k)}^{(i)}\left(\frac{x-a_i}{r_i}\right) + \tilde{u}(a_i) & \text{if } x \in B(a_i, r_i), a_i \in R, \\ r_i^{1-d} c_i^{-1} v_{j(i,k)}^{(i)}\left(\frac{x-a_i}{r_i}\right) + \bar{u}^{(i)} & \text{if } x \in Q_i(a_i, r_i), a_i \in S, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{u}(a_i)$ is the value of the precise representative $\tilde{u}$ of u at a_i (which is defined at $a_i \in R$), and $\bar{u}^{(i)} := \int_{Q_i(a_i, r_i)} u \, dx$. For the gradient of the w_k we get

$$Dw_k = \nabla w_k \mathcal{L}^d \llcorner \Omega + D^s w_k$$

with

$$\nabla w_k(x) = \begin{cases} \nabla v_{j(i,k)}^{(i)}\left(\frac{x-a_i}{r_i}\right) & \text{if } x \in B(a_i, r_i), a_i \in R, \\ r_i^{-d} c_i^{-1} \nabla v_{j(i,k)}^{(i)}\left(\frac{x-a_i}{r_i}\right) & \text{if } x \in Q_i(a_i, r_i), a_i \in S. \end{cases}$$

We can estimate the singular part $D^s w_k$ as follows (by the triangle inequality and the choice of covering):

$$\begin{aligned} |D^s w_k|(\Omega) &\leq \sum_i \int_{\partial K_i(a_i, r_i)} |v_{j(i,k)}^{(i)} - u| \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \leq \sum_i \frac{1}{k} \langle \mathbb{1}_{K_i(a_i, r_i)} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

As an immediate consequence, for all $f \in \mathbf{E}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ with linear growth constant $M > 0$,

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} f^{\infty} \left(x, \frac{dD^s w_k}{d|D^s w_k|}(x) \right) d|D^s w_k|(x) \right| \leq \frac{M}{k} \langle \mathbb{1} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle.$$

This estimate implies that to determine the Young measure generated by Dw_k it suffices to consider the absolutely continuous part $\nabla w_k \mathcal{L}^d \llcorner \Omega$, i.e. for $\ell \leq k$ we need to identify the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ of

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} \varphi_{\ell}(x) h_{\ell}(\nabla w_k(x)) \, dx \\ &= \sum_{i: a_i \in R} \int_{B(a_i, r_i)} \varphi_{\ell}(x) h_{\ell} \left(\nabla v_{j(i,k)}^{(i)} \left(\frac{x-a_i}{r_i} \right) \right) \, dx \\ &\quad + \sum_{i: a_i \in S} \int_{Q_i(a_i, r_i)} \varphi_{\ell}(x) h_{\ell} \left(r_i^{-d} c_i^{-1} \nabla v_{j(i,k)}^{(i)} \left(\frac{x-a_i}{r_i} \right) \right) \, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

We also introduce the following notation (recall that the a_i and r_i depend on the value of k , despite this being suppressed in the notation):

$$\mathcal{R}_k = \bigcup_{a_i \in R} B(a_i, r_i), \quad \mathcal{S}_k := \bigcup_{a_i \in S} Q_i(a_i, r_i).$$

Step 4. Notice that every $a_i \in R$ may be chosen to be a Lebesgue point for the function

$$x \mapsto \varphi_{\ell}(x) \left(\langle h_{\ell}, \nu_x \rangle + \langle h_{\ell}^{\infty}, \nu_x^{\infty} \rangle \frac{d\lambda_{\nu}}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x) \right).$$

Then, using (5.5), the integral in (5.6) for $a_i \in R$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B(a_i, r_i)} \varphi_\ell(x) h_\ell \left(\nabla v_{j(i, k)}^{(i)} \left(\frac{x - a_i}{r_i} \right) \right) dx \\
&= r_i^d \varphi_\ell(a_i) \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} h_\ell(\nabla v_{j(i, k)}^{(i)}(y)) dy + \underbrace{r_i^d o(1) \left(1 + \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} |\nabla v_{j(i, k)}^{(i)}(y)| dy \right)}_{=: E_i} \\
&= r_i^d \varphi_\ell(a_i) \langle \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{B}^d} \otimes h_\ell, \sigma_i \rangle + E_i \\
&= r_i^d \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} \varphi_\ell(a_i) \left(\langle h_\ell, \nu_{a_i} \rangle + \langle h_\ell^\infty, \nu_{a_i}^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(a_i) \right) dy + E_i \\
&= r_i^d \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} \varphi_\ell(a_i + r_i y) \left(\langle h_\ell, \nu_{a_i + r_i y} \rangle + \langle h_\ell^\infty, \nu_{a_i + r_i y}^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(a_i + r_i y) \right) dy + E_i \\
&= \int_{B(a_i, r_i)} \varphi_\ell(x) \left(\langle h_\ell, \nu_x \rangle + \langle h_\ell^\infty, \nu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x) \right) dx + E_i. \tag{5.7}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the ℓ -dependent term $o(1)$ goes to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$ (and absorbs all constants, including $\|\varphi_\ell\|_\infty$). Note that the constant in the error term E_i may change from line to line. Changing variables,

$$E_i = o(1) \int_{B(a_i, r_i)} 1 + \left| \nabla v_{j(i, k)}^{(i)} \left(\frac{x - a_i}{r_i} \right) \right| dx.$$

In fact, observe that for $\varphi_\ell \equiv 1$ and $h_\ell = |\cdot|$ we can apply an analogous reasoning to get

$$\int_{B(a_i, r_i)} \left| \nabla v_{j(i, k)}^{(i)} \left(\frac{x - a_i}{r_i} \right) \right| dx = \langle \mathbb{1}_{B(a_i, r_i)} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle + o(1) |B(a_i, r_i)|,$$

whereby $\|\nabla w_k\|_{L^1(\mathcal{R}_k; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})}$ is uniformly (in k) bounded. Plugging (5.7) into (5.6) and taking into consideration the bound just proved, we have for fixed ℓ such that h_ℓ has compact support in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ (whereby it is bounded)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \varphi_\ell(x) h_\ell(\nabla w_k(x)) dx \\
&= \sum_{i: a_i \in R} \int_{B(a_i, r_i)} \varphi_\ell(x) \left(\langle h_\ell, \nu_x \rangle + \langle h_\ell^\infty, \nu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x) \right) dx \\
&\quad + o(1) [|\mathcal{R}_k| + \|\nabla w_k\|_{L^1(\mathcal{R}_k; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})}] + |\mathcal{S}_k| \cdot \|\varphi_\ell h_\ell\|_\infty \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \varphi_\ell(x) \left(\langle h_\ell, \nu_x \rangle + \langle h_\ell^\infty, \nu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x) \right) dx + o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

since $|\mathcal{S}_k| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, we have shown

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \varphi_\ell(x) h_\ell(\nabla w_k(x)) dx = \langle \varphi_\ell \otimes h_\ell, \nu \rangle \tag{5.8}$$

for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that h_ℓ has compact support.

Step 5. Next, we recall from Lemma 2.2 that all h_ℓ without compact support are in fact positively 1-homogeneous. Moreover, the proof of the singular localization principle entails that every $a_i \in S$ is a λ_ν^s -Lebesgue point of the function

$$x \mapsto \langle h_\ell^\infty, \nu_x^\infty \rangle.$$

Thus, for such h_ℓ and $a_i \in S$ we get, using (5.4), (5.5) and the assertions above,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{Q_i(a_i, r_i)} \varphi_\ell(x) h_\ell \left(r_i^{-d} c_i^{-1} \nabla v_{j(i,k)}^{(i)} \left(\frac{x - a_i}{r_i} \right) \right) dx \\
&= \frac{1}{c_i} \varphi_\ell(a_i) \int_{Q_i} h_\ell(\nabla v_{j(i,k)}^{(i)}(y)) dy + \underbrace{\frac{o(1)}{c_i} \left(1 + \int_{Q_i} |\nabla v_{j(i,k)}^{(i)}(y)| dy \right)}_{=: E_i} \\
&= \frac{1}{c_i} \varphi_\ell(a_i) \langle \mathbb{1}_{Q_i} \otimes h_\ell, \sigma_i \rangle + E_i \\
&= \frac{1}{c_i} \int_{Q_i} \varphi_\ell(a_i) \langle h_\ell, \nu_{a_i}^\infty \rangle d\lambda_\sigma(y) + E_i \\
&= \frac{1}{c_i} \int_{Q_i} \varphi_\ell(a_i) \langle h_\ell, \nu_{a_i}^\infty \rangle d(c_i T_*^{(x_0, r_i)} \lambda_\nu^s)(y) + E_i \\
&= \int_{Q_i} \varphi_\ell(a_i + r_i y) \langle h_\ell, \nu_{a_i + r_i y}^\infty \rangle d(T_*^{(x_0, r_i)} \lambda_\nu^s)(y) + E_i \\
&= \int_{Q_i(a_i, r_i)} \varphi_\ell(x) \langle h_\ell, \nu_x^\infty \rangle d\lambda_\nu^s(x) + E_i, \tag{5.9}
\end{aligned}$$

where as for regular points the constant in E_i may change from line to line. We further get by a change of variables

$$E_i = o(1) \left(\langle \mathbb{1}_{Q(a_i, r_i)} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle + \int_{Q_i(a_i, r_i)} \left| r_i^{-d} c_i^{-1} \nabla v_{j(i,k)}^{(i)} \left(\frac{x - a_i}{r_i} \right) \right| dx \right),$$

Also, we may derive in a similar fashion,

$$\int_{Q_i(a_i, r_i)} \left| r_i^{-d} c_i^{-1} \nabla v_{j(i,k)}^{(i)} \left(\frac{x - a_i}{r_i} \right) \right| dx \leq (1 + o(1)) \langle \mathbb{1}_{Q_i(a_i, r_i)} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle,$$

hence $\|\nabla w_k\|_{L^1(S_k; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})}$ is uniformly bounded. Then, also using the previous step for the regular points, (5.6) in conjunction with (5.9) yields for fixed ℓ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \varphi_\ell(x) h_\ell(\nabla w_k(x)) dx \\
&= \sum_{i: a_i \in R} \int_{B(a_i, r_i)} \varphi_\ell(x) \left(\langle h_\ell, \nu_x \rangle + \langle h_\ell, \nu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x) \right) dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{i: a_i \in S} \int_{Q_i(a_i, r_i)} \varphi_\ell(x) \langle h_\ell, \nu_x^\infty \rangle d\lambda_\nu^s(x) \\
&\quad + o(1) [\mathcal{R}_k + \langle \mathbb{1}_{S_k} \otimes |\cdot|, \nu \rangle + \|\nabla w_k\|_{L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})}] \\
&= \langle \varphi_\ell \otimes h_\ell, \nu \rangle + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have arrived at

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \varphi_\ell(x) h_\ell(\nabla w_k(x)) dx = \langle \varphi_\ell \otimes h_\ell, \nu \rangle \tag{5.10}$$

for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that h_ℓ is positively 1-homogeneous.

Since in the course of the above proof we showed a uniform L^1 -norm bound on (∇w_k) , passing to a subsequence if necessary, (Dw_k) generates a gradient Young measure $\mu \in \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n})$. But by (5.8) and (5.10), only $\mu = \nu$ is possible and so ν has been shown to be a gradient Young measure. $\square$

We close this section by the following curious fact, first observed in [14]:

Remark 5.1. Condition (ii) in Theorem 1.1 is always satisfied: Since $[\nu] = Du$, it holds that $\langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle = \frac{dD^s u}{d|D^s u|}(x)$ for $|D^s u|$ -almost every $x \in \Omega$ and by Alberti's Rank One Theorem [1] this matrix has rank one ($|D^s u|$ -a.e.). The main result of [14] entails that every quasiconvex (hence rank-one convex) and positively 1-homogeneous $g: \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is in fact convex at the rank-one matrix $\langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle$, whereby the second condition in Theorem 1.1 reduces to the classical Jensen inequality and so is always satisfied. More precisely, the result from [14] says that there exists a linear function $\ell: \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\ell(\langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle) = g(\langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle)$ and $\ell \leq g$. Then,

$$g(\langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle) = \ell(\langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle) = \int \ell(A) d\nu_x(A) \leq \int g(A) d\nu_x(A) = \langle g, \nu_x \rangle,$$

which is nothing else than condition (ii) in Theorem 1.1.

6. CHARACTERIZATION OF YOUNG MEASURES IN BD

We now show how the characterization theorem for Young measures generated by sequences in BV can be extended to Young measures generated by sequences in the space BD of functions of bounded deformation.

In [26] the following structure result about BD-functions was proved:

Theorem 6.1 (Good singular blow-ups). *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{BDY}(\Omega)$ be a BD-Young measure. For λ_ν^s -almost every $x_0 \in \Omega$, there exists a singular tangent Young measure $\sigma \in \mathbf{BDY}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as in Proposition 2.8 (with the appropriate changes) such that additionally for any $v \in \mathbf{BD}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $Ev = [\sigma]$ the appropriate assertion among the following three holds:*

- (i) *If $\langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle \notin \{a \odot b : a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}\}$ (this includes the case $\langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle = 0$), then v is equal to an affine function almost everywhere.*
- (ii) *If $\langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle = a \odot b$ ($a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$) with $a \neq b$, then there exist functions $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbf{BV}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$, $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and a skew-symmetric matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{d \times d}$ such that*

$$v(x) = v_0 + h_1(x \cdot a)b + h_2(x \cdot b)a + Rx, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ a.e.}$$

- (iii) *If $\langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle = a \odot a$ ($a \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$), then there exists a function $h \in \mathbf{BV}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$, $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a skew-symmetric matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{d \times d}$ such that*

$$v(x) = v_0 + h(x \cdot a)a + Rx, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ a.e.}$$

We will now state and prove a strengthened version of this theorem. We note that this improvement in fact allows to slightly simplify the proof of the lower semicontinuity result in [26].

Theorem 6.2 (Better singular blow-ups). *In the situation of Theorem 6.1 instead of (i)–(iii) we can require that any $v \in \mathbf{BD}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $Ev = [\sigma]$ even satisfies the appropriate of the following two assertions:*

- (i) *If $\langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle \notin \{a \odot b : a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}\}$ (this includes the case $\langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle = 0$), then v is equal to an affine function almost everywhere.*
- (ii) *If $\langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle = a \odot b$ ($a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, not necessarily $a \neq b$), then for $(\xi, \eta) = (a, b)$ or for $(\xi, \eta) = (b, a)$ there exist a function $h \in \mathbf{BV}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$, $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that*

$$v(x) = v_0 + h(x \cdot \xi)\eta + Ax, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ a.e.}$$

Proof. Only in the case $\langle \text{id}, \nu_{x_0}^\infty \rangle = a \odot b$ with $a \neq b$ there is something left to prove. Without loss of generality we assume that $a = e_1$ and $b = e_2$. In this case, from the previous Theorem 6.1 we get that there exists a singular tangent Young measure $\kappa \in \mathbf{BDY}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that for any $w \in \text{BD}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $Ev = [\kappa]$ there exist functions $g_1, g_2 \in \text{BV}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$, $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and a skew-symmetric matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{d \times d}$ such that

$$w(y) = w_0 + g_1(y^1)e_2 + g_2(y^2)e_1 + Rx, \quad y = (y^1, y^2) \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ a.e.}$$

If both Dg_1 and Dg_2 are the zero measure, the conclusion of the theorem is trivially true, so henceforth assume that Dg_1 is not the zero measure, otherwise exchange the roles of a and b , and those of g_1 and g_2 .

The measure $Dg_1 \otimes \mathcal{L}^{d-1}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to λ_κ . So, via the regular or singular localization principle for BD-Young measures, i.e. the BD-equivalents of Propositions 2.7 and 2.8 (stated and proved for BD in [26]), we may find $s_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ with the property that for $\mathcal{L}^{d-1}$ -almost all $(t, y^3, \dots, y^d)$ there exists a non-zero regular or singular tangent Young measure of κ at $(s_0, t, y^3, \dots, y^d)$. Moreover, for $\mathcal{L}^1$ -almost every $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{r} \int_{t_0-r}^{t_0+r} |\nabla g_2(t) - c_0| dt = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{r} |D^s g_2|((t_0 - r, t_0 + r)) = 0$$

with a constant $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ (possibly $c_0 = 0$), because the set of Lebesgue points of ∇g_2 has full Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{R}$ and the Radon–Nikodým derivative of $D^s g_2$ by $\mathcal{L}^1$ is zero $\mathcal{L}^1$ -almost everywhere. Thus, we may find $y_0 = (s_0, t_0, y_0^3, \dots, y_0^d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that there exists a non-zero regular/singular tangent Young measure $\sigma \in \mathbf{BDY}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to κ at y_0 and t_0 satisfies the above conditions.

Just like in the proof of the Good Blow-ups Theorem 6.1 we can observe that σ is still a singular tangent Young measure to ν at the original point x_0 if the latter was chosen suitably. Indeed, it can be easily checked that the property of being a singular tangent Young measure is preserved when passing to another “inner” (regular or singular) tangent Young measure; the only non-obvious fact here is that “tangent measures of tangent measures are tangent measures”, but this is well-known and proved for example in Theorem 14.16 of [20].

The “inner” blow-up sequence has the form

$$w^{(n)}(z) := r_n^{d-1} c_n w(y_0 + r_n z), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

with $r_n \downarrow 0$ and constants $c_n > 0$. To retain a BD-uniformly bounded sequence, it might also be necessary to add an (n -dependent) fixed vector to $w^{(n)}$, but for ease of notation this is omitted above. Then, $w^{(n)} \xrightarrow{*} v$ in $\text{BD}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and v has the property that $Ev = [\sigma]$. For $Ev^{(n)}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} Ev^{(n)} &= r_n^d c_n [\nabla g_1(t_0 + r_n z^1) + \nabla g_2(t_0 + r_n z^2)](a \odot b) \mathcal{L}_z^d \\ &\quad + c_n T_*^{(y_0, r_n)} [D^s g_1 \otimes \mathcal{L}^{d-1} + \mathcal{L}^1 \otimes D^s g_2 \otimes \mathcal{L}^{d-2}](a \odot b). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and choose $R > 0$ so large that $\text{supp } \varphi \subset \subset Q(0, R) = (-R, R)^d$. Using the special properties of our choice of y_0 together with the fact that $c_n \lesssim r_n^{-d}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (which follows for example from Besicovitch’s Differentiation Theorem, Theorem 2.22 in [3]), we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} r_n^d c_n \int \varphi(z) |\nabla g_2(t_0 + r_n z^2) - c_0| dz &= c_n \int \varphi\left(\frac{y - y_0}{r_n}\right) |\nabla g_2(y^2) - c_0| dy \\ &\leq C \|\varphi\|_\infty \frac{1}{r_n^d} \int_{Q(y_0, r_n R)} |\nabla g_2(y^2) - c_0| dy \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
c_n \int \varphi \, dT_{*}^{(y_0, r_n)} [\mathcal{L}^1 \otimes D^s g_2 \otimes \mathcal{L}^{d-2}] \\
&= c_n \int \int \varphi \left(\frac{y - y_0}{r_n} \right) \, dD^s g_2(y_2) \, d(y_1, y_3, \dots, y_d) \\
&\leq C \|\varphi\|_{\infty} \frac{|D^s g_2|(t_0 + (-r_n R, r_n R)) \cdot \mathcal{L}^{d-1}((s_0, y_0^2, \dots, y_0^d) + (-r_n R, r_n R)^{d-1})}{r_n^d} \\
&\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the e_2 -directional parts of $Ew^{(n)}$ in the limit converge to the *fixed* matrix $\alpha c_0(a \odot b)$, where $\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n^d c_n$ (this limit exists after taking a subsequence). More precisely, if $c_n \sim r^{-d}$ and σ is a regular tangent Young measure to κ , then $\alpha \neq 0$, otherwise $\alpha = 0$. The e_1 -directional parts of $Ew^{(n)}$ clearly stay e_1 -directional under the operation of taking weak* limits. Thus, v is of the required form (with $(\xi, \eta) = (e_1, e_2)$). $\square$

Replacing the invocation of the BV-Rigidity Lemma at the beginning of Step 2 in Section 5 with an application of the previous Theorem 6.2, the proof of the characterization theorem in BV adapts almost line-by-line to the situation in BD. Of course, we need to change gradients and derivatives to their respective symmetric versions, and replace quasiconvexity by symmetric-quasiconvexity. We omit the details.

Together with the lower semicontinuity result from [26], this strategy yields a proof of the characterization theorem for Young measures in BD, Theorem 1.3.

7. SPLITTING OF GENERATING SEQUENCES

In this final section we briefly discuss an application of the BV-characterization theorem to the splitting of generating sequences for Young measures with an “atomic” part. Consider a gradient Young measure $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ with the property that for a given function $v \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ the concentration part of ν has the following two properties:

- (i) The measures $\lambda_{\nu} - |D^s v|$ and $|D^s v|$ are mutually singular,
- (ii) $\nu_x^{\infty} = \delta_{p(x)}$, where $p(x) = \frac{dD^s v}{d|D^s v|}(x)$, for $|D^s v|$ -almost every $x \in \Omega$.

Intuitively, (i) and (ii) mean that Dv is an “atomic” part of μ (the absolutely continuous part is actually uncritical, the issue is the concentration part). For reasons of simplicity let us also assume that

- (iii) $\lambda_{\nu}(\partial\Omega) = 0$,

otherwise one has to embed the functions and Young measures into a larger domain and take into account boundary terms.

The natural conjecture now is that under the assumptions (i)–(iii) one can find a generating sequence $(u_j) \subset \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ for ν of the form $u_j = w_j + v$ with $(w_j) \subset \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ and $Dw_j \xrightarrow{*} [\nu] - Dv$, that is, the atomic part can be split off in the generating sequence. However, when trying to prove this result one faces the difficulty that it is easy to *add* concentrations, but very difficult in general to *remove* them (cf. Proposition 6 in [16] on shifting of Young measures). Indeed, naively setting $w_j := u_j - v$, where Du_j is a generating sequence for ν will not have the desired effect if $(u_j) \subset C^{\infty}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$. In fact, this procedure corresponds to shifting ν by $-Dv$ via Proposition 6 in [16] and only results in a (gradient) Young measure with the concentration part

$$\nu_x^{\infty} [\lambda_{\nu}(x) - |D^s v|] + \delta_{p(x)} |D^s v|(x) + \delta_{-p(x)} |D^s v|(x),$$

but the last two parts do not cancel. So, using direct manipulations only, it seems rather hard to cut off the atomic part from a generating sequences, while at the same time preserving the curl-freeness.

We will now use the characterization theorem in BV to prove the conjecture. Define the Young measure $\mu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle h, \mu_x \rangle &:= \langle h(\cdot - \nabla v(x), \nu_x) \rangle \quad \text{for } \mathcal{L}^d\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ and all } h \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d}), \\ \lambda_\mu &:= \lambda_\nu - |D^s v| \in \mathbf{M}^+(\overline{\Omega}), \\ \mu_x^\infty &:= \nu_x^\infty \quad \text{for } \lambda_\mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega.\end{aligned}$$

By our assumptions (i)–(iii) this definition always yields a Young measure $\mu \in \mathbf{Y}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ with $[\mu] = [\nu] - Dv$. In particular, (i) and the fact that $\lambda_\nu \in \mathbf{M}^+(\overline{\Omega})$ entail that also λ_μ is a *positive* measure.

Now, if $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ is a quasiconvex function with linear growth at infinity, then also $\tilde{h}: \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $\tilde{h}(A) := h(A - \nabla v(x))$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ has these properties, and from the necessity part of the characterization theorem applied to the gradient Young measure ν it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}h\left(\langle \text{id}, \mu_x \rangle + \langle \text{id}, \mu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x)\right) &= \tilde{h}\left(\langle \text{id}, \nu_x \rangle + \langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x)\right) \\ &\leq \langle \tilde{h}, \nu_x \rangle + \langle \tilde{h}^\#, \nu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x) \\ &= \langle h, \mu_x \rangle + \langle h^\#, \mu_x^\infty \rangle \frac{d\lambda_\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^d}(x)\end{aligned}$$

since $\tilde{h}^\# = h^\#$ and $\mu_x^\infty = \nu_x^\infty$ λ_μ -almost everywhere. Moreover,

$$h^\#(\langle \text{id}, \mu_x^\infty \rangle) = h^\#(\langle \text{id}, \nu_x^\infty \rangle) \leq \langle h^\#, \nu_x^\infty \rangle = \langle h^\#, \mu_x^\infty \rangle$$

for λ_μ^s -almost every $x \in \Omega$.

The previous calculations show that μ satisfies the assumptions of the sufficiency part of the characterization theorem, whereby $\mu \in \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Hence, there exists a sequence $(w_j) \subset (C^\infty \cap W^{1,1})(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ (also see Lemma 2.3) with $Dw_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \mu$. Then it is not difficult to see that the sequence $Dw_j + Dv$ indeed generates the original Young measure ν , for details see Proposition 6 in [16]. Hence we have proved:

Proposition 7.1. *Let $\nu \in \mathbf{GY}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ satisfy the conditions (i)–(iii) above. Then, there exists a generating sequence $(u_j) \subset \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)$ for ν (i.e. $Du_j \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Y}} \nu$) and u_j can be split as*

$$u_j = w_j + v \quad \text{with } (w_j) \subset (C^\infty \cap W^{1,1})(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m) \text{ and } Dw_j \xrightarrow{*} [\nu] - Dv.$$

Remark 7.2. Of course, the previous proposition after the appropriate changes also holds for BD-Young measures.

We close this section with remarks about the situation where $\lambda_\nu - |D^s v|$ and $|D^s v|$ are not mutually singular and the concentration effects may interfere (for example in the common situation that $v = u$, where $[\nu] = Du$). In this case we need to *require* that the concentration part of ν can be written in the form

$$\nu_x^\infty \lambda_\nu(x) = \mu_x^\infty \lambda_\mu(x) + \delta_{p(x)} |D^s v|(x), \quad p(x) = \frac{dD^s v}{d|D^s v|}(x),$$

for another family $(\mu_x)_{x \in \Omega} \subset \mathbf{M}^+(\partial \mathbb{B}^{m \times d})$ of *positive* (sub-probability) measures and a *positive* measure $\lambda_\mu \in \mathbf{M}^+(\overline{\Omega})$ (notice that these positivity properties are not automatic

anymore). The regular Jensen-type inequality is proved exactly as before and by the main result of [14], the singular Jensen-type inequality is always satisfied, cf. Remark 5.1, so we can again employ the characterization result to conclude.

Notice that for BD-functions we have no analogue of Alberti's Rank One Theorem, so the conclusion of Remark 5.1 does not necessarily hold in the space BD. Hence, also the extension of the last paragraph to the corresponding situation in BD is not possible.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Alberti, *Rank one property for derivatives of functions with bounded variation*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **123** (1993), 239–274.
- [2] L. Ambrosio, A. Coscia, and G. Dal Maso, *Fine properties of functions with bounded deformation*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **139** (1997), 201–238.
- [3] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, and D. Pallara, *Functions of Bounded Variation and Free-Discontinuity Problems*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [4] J. M. Ball and R. D. James, *Fine phase mixtures as minimizers of energy*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **100** (1987), 13–52.
- [5] A. C. Barroso, I. Fonseca, and R. Toader, *A relaxation theorem in the space of functions of bounded deformation*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. **29** (2000), 19–49.
- [6] J. B. Conway, *A Course in Functional Analysis*, 2nd ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 96, Springer, 1990.
- [7] B. Dacorogna, *Direct Methods in the Calculus of Variations*, 2nd ed., Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 78, Springer, 2008.
- [8] R. J. DiPerna and A. J. Majda, *Oscillations and concentrations in weak solutions of the incompressible fluid equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **108** (1987), 667–689.
- [9] F. Ebobisse, *On lower semicontinuity of integral functionals in $LD(\Omega)$* , Ricerche Mat. **49** (2000), no. 1, 65–76.
- [10] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, 1992.
- [11] I. Fonseca and M. Kružík, *Oscillations and concentrations generated by $\mathcal{A}$ -free mappings and weak lower semicontinuity of integral functionals*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **16** (2010), 472–502.
- [12] D. Kinderlehrer and P. Pedregal, *Characterizations of Young measures generated by gradients*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **115** (1991), 329–365.
- [13] ———, *Gradient Young measures generated by sequences in Sobolev spaces*, J. Geom. Anal. **4** (1994), 59–90.
- [14] B. Kirchheim and J. Kristensen, *Automatic convexity of rank-1 convex functions*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **349** (2011), 407–409.
- [15] J. Kristensen, *Lower semicontinuity in spaces of weakly differentiable functions*, Math. Ann. **313** (1999), 653–710.
- [16] J. Kristensen and F. Rindler, *Characterization of generalized gradient Young measures generated by sequences in $W^{1,1}$ and BV*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **197** (2010), 539–598.
- [17] ———, *Relaxation of signed integral functionals in BV*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **37** (2010), 29–62.
- [18] M. Kružík and T. Roubíček, *Explicit characterization of L^p -Young measures*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **198** (1996), 830–843.
- [19] H. Matthies, G. Strang, and E. Christiansen, *The saddle point of a differential program*, Energy methods in finite element analysis, Wiley, 1979, pp. 309–318.
- [20] P. Mattila, *Geometry of Sets and Measures in Euclidean Spaces*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 44, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [21] C. B. Morrey, Jr., *Quasiconvexity and the semicontinuity of multiple integrals*, Pacific J. Math. **2** (1952), 25–53.
- [22] A. P. Morse, *Perfect blankets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **61** (1947), 418–442.
- [23] P. Pedregal, *Parametrized Measures and Variational Principles*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, vol. 30, Birkhäuser, 1997.

- [24] F. Rindler, *Lower semicontinuity and Young measures in BV without Alberti's Rank-One Theorem*, Adv. Calc. Var. (2010), to appear (Ahead of Print: DOI 10.1515/ACV.2011.008; submitted February 2010).
- [25] F. Rindler, *Lower Semicontinuity and Young Measures for Integral Functionals with Linear Growth*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Oxford, 2011.
- [26] F. Rindler, *Lower semicontinuity for integral functionals in the space of functions of bounded deformation via rigidity and Young measures*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **202** (2011), 63–113.
- [27] P.-M. Suquet, *Existence et régularité des solutions des équations de la plasticité*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A **286** (1978), 1201–1204.
- [28] ———, *Un espace fonctionnel pour les équations de la plasticité*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. **1** (1979), 77–87.
- [29] M. A. Sychev, *Characterization of homogeneous gradient Young measures in case of arbitrary integrands*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. **29** (2000), 531–548.
- [30] L. Székelyhidi, Jr. and E. Wiedemann, *Young measures generated by ideal incompressible fluid flows*, submitted, arXiv:1101.3499, January 2011.
- [31] L. Tartar, *Compensated compactness and applications to partial differential equations*, Nonlinear analysis and mechanics: Heriot-Watt Symposium, Vol. IV, Res. Notes in Math., vol. 39, Pitman, 1979, pp. 136–212.
- [32] R. Temam and G. Strang, *Functions of bounded deformation*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **75** (1980), 7–21.
- [33] W. P. Ziemer, *Weakly differentiable functions*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 120, Springer, 1989.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE, CAMBRIDGE CENTRE FOR ANALYSIS, CENTRE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES,
WILBERFORCE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE CB3 0WA, UK.

Postal address: Gonville & Caius College, Trinity Street, Cambridge CB2 1TA, UK.

E-mail address: F.Rindler@maths.cam.ac.uk